THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY E. G. SELWYN, D.D.

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

LEONARD HODGSON, D.D.

VOLUME XXVI.

JANUARY—JUNE, 1933

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING

CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

A MANUAL FOR READING ON

THEOLOGY

LEONARD HODGSON, D.D.

CANON AND REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

EDITED BY E. C. SELWYN, D.D.

DEAN OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Dean of Winchester, The Deanery, Winchester, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXVI JANUARY, 1933 No. 151

EDITORIAL

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT EDITOR

We are glad to be able to give further particulars of the editorial reinforcement which we adumbrated in these notes last month; and we feel sure that our readers will welcome the strength which Canon Hodgson will bring to Theology as Assistant Editor. Canon Hodgson's two books *And was made Man* and *Essays in Christian Philosophy* are well known to all who are interested in the broader aspects of Christian doctrine and thought; and he has from time to time contributed articles and reviews to this Journal. Since his return to England last year, Canon Hodgson has been actively engaged in the encouragement of clerical studies, through the Way of Renewal and otherwise, both within and without the Diocese of Winchester; and he has edited for the B.B.C. the new series of instructional addresses on the Christian faith which are to form part of the Broadcast Sunday programmes during 1933.

An editorial partnership of this kind has to develop its methods as it proceeds. The general policy of the Journal will be unchanged, and the Editor will be responsible as heretofore for any unsigned editorials or notes; but the Assistant Editor, in addition to helping with the choice of articles to be published, will interest himself especially in the section entitled Miscellanea, and endeavour to make it of greater value. Both he and the Editor will continue to be grateful for the material which readers and others contribute from time to time. And the Journal will still be indebted to Dr. Lowther Clarke, whose assistance in every department of it is a good deal larger than is suggested merely by the occasions when his signature appears.

FORERUNNERS OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

I

WE are on the eve of celebrating throughout the length and breadth of England the centenary of that great revival in Church life which we call the Oxford Movement. When we celebrate the centenary of some historical person we have generally two dates which we may choose as the terminus from which to count our century of years, those of his birth and death. If some historical event is to be commemorated, we have again a fixed and determinate date. But when we endeavour to keep the centenary of a "movement," the choice of a date upon which that movement may be said to have begun becomes a matter where argument may conceivably be allowed. The very word "movement" implies a beginning, but it is not always easy to say at what moment any movement does begin: the choice is bound to be in many cases arbitrary. In the case of the Oxford Movement it has been generally assumed that the Movement began with John Keble's famous "Assize" Sermon on July 14, 1833, and thus July, 1933, has been chosen for the "Centenary of the Oxford Movement." If a date must be chosen, no doubt this is as good as any other, despite the fact that Newman spoke of the publication of Keble's *Christian Year* as the *fons et origo* of the Movement. We must also remember that the now celebrated "Assize" Sermon aroused very little interest at the time, and can hardly therefore be sufficiently important to have kindled the fire of enthusiasm and counter-enthusiasm which broke over England during the next few years. The incident which evoked this particular sermon was the suppression by the English Government of certain Irish bishoprics. But this secular interference called forth something much more important than a sermon: it drove the more enlightened Churchmen to think out again, and with greater care, what exactly they meant by the expression "the Catholic Church" and all that it implies. Those thoughts are what we find expressed in the *Tracts for the Times*. Newman's *Tract I.*, bursting with fervour and loyalty, is the outpouring of a man who has suddenly come to realize the glorious privilege of membership in the Catholic Church. Hard on its heels came a whole series of Tracts on the Apostolic Succession; and so the train was laid which led to the explosion of *Tract XC*.

But that sense of Churchmanship, of Apostolic Succession,

of Catholicity was by no means unfamiliar in the days of Newman. Every contrary movement had caused men to think out anew the meaning of Churchmanship; and, long before the famous *Tracts* appeared, the best High Churchmen of the day had arrived at conclusions differing not very greatly from those of Newman and his friends.

During the sixty or seventy years before Keble began to speak there had been a movement a great deal further-reaching than the suppression of some of the Irish bishoprics; and that was the movement associated with the name of John Wesley. It is generally known that Wesley lived and died a Churchman, though a somewhat irregular Churchman, and that he tried to persuade his followers also to remain within the Church's fold. Had the Church been more active, and more careful for its own well-being, it is conceivable that the separation of the Wesleyans might have been avoided. In the circumstances, with Convocation in abeyance and with many of the higher clergy far too busy with other and more worldly concerns, the Church was utterly unable to make any united stand. Samuel Wesley wrote of his brother John in the infancy of the Movement: "I am not afraid that the Church will excommunicate him (discipline is at too low an ebb for that), but that he will excommunicate the Church." In other words, from the very beginning of the Movement the state of the Church was such that the theories and practices of men like Wesley and Whitefield could find no peace within it. The inevitable result on the side of the revivalists was, in spite of Wesley's injunctions, separatism. Upon the Church the effect was twofold: the devout Evangelicals turned to "good works" and immediately became a tremendous power for good in the land: the best of the High Churchmen started thinking seriously about the nature of the Church and of Catholicity, and so gave a start to that later revival, the Oxford Movement.

II

Among those who were driven by the spectacle of the Wesleyan Movement to turn their minds to a serious consideration of the nature of Churchmanship were William Jones of Nayland, William Stevens, a London merchant, Charles Daubeny, Archdeacon of Sarum, and Thomas Sikes of Guilsborough.

William Jones, Rector of Paston, Northamptonshire, and curate of Nayland in Suffolk, was both the oldest and the most interesting of this group.* A man of deep thought and con-

* Jones was born in 1726, Stevens in 1732, Daubeny in 1745, and Sikes in 1767.

siderable scientific knowledge, he wrote, besides articles on Electricity and Natural Philosophy, a remarkable work called *Zoologia Ethica, a Disquisition concerning the Mosaic Distinction of Animals into Clean and Unclean*, wherein he traces a "moral design," and finds among the "various instincts, properties and manners" of the animals abundant moral lessons for their human relatives. Apart from such vagaries of thought Jones was of a saintly character, besides being a devoted Churchman and a gifted musician.* He shares with John Jebb the distinction of being recommended by the Tractarians for the edification of their readers, the work so mentioned being his *Essay on the Church*.

William Stevens, the friend and biographer of Jones, was some six years his junior. He was a London merchant and a man of considerable means who found time in the midst of his business duties to be an active supporter of the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G., Treasurer of Queen Anne's Bounty, and an unwearied worker for almost any cause directly connected with the Church. There might truly have been said of him what Archdeacon Churton said of H. H. Norris: "There was a strong conviction in the mind of this benevolent and zealous man that the dangers of the time, and the conflicts to which the Christian cause was subjected . . . were only to be effectually met by a spirit of earnest self-devotion and large sacrifices of private wealth and liberty and ease." Though in his writings Stevens was stilted and pompous to a degree, in his conversation with the world he was a most whimsical and delightful man.† His natural humility drove him to refer to himself as "Nobody," and "Nobody's Club" became quite famous at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He was a man of unbounded generosity, chiefly towards the clergy, and generally anonymously under his self-denying pseudonym. In the midst of his good works he found time for thought, and in 1773 published *An Essay on the Nature and Constitution of the Christian Church*.

Charles Daubeny, Archdeacon of Sarum, was one of the most rigid Churchmen of his time. He was of a rich mercantile family and, like Stevens, spent vast sums of money on schemes

* Jones is nowadays chiefly known as the composer of the hymn tune "St. Stephen" (E.H. 492). It is interesting to note that this tune, originally written for "psalmody," was at first called "Nayland," after his parish; but his friend William Stevens admired it so much that Jones altered its name to "Stevens." Compilers of hymn-books immediately mis-spelt it as "St. Stephen's," and it now appears as "St. Stephen." We read that Stevens quite willingly acquiesced in his false canonization.

† He was accustomed to refer to the Poor Clergy Relief Corporation as the "Ragged Parsons," a joking reference to Mr. Pounds' more famous "Ragged Schools."

connected with the Church.* Unlike the gentle Stevens, Daubeny was a writer of energy and conviction, publishing some eighteen works besides his charges to the clergy. Rigidly orthodox, he was not too popular among those who were accustomed to take a less exalted view of the Church, though his most liberal generosity could not but arouse their admiration. At Bath he built what was actually the first "free Church" in the country.† The fact that his first sermon in support of this scheme realised £1,200 shows that he must have been at least a convincing preacher. He was made Archdeacon of Sarum in 1804, D.C.L. of Oxford in 1822, and died in 1827 at the advanced age of eighty-two.

His most important work was his *Guide to the Church*, published in 1798, with two appendices added later. This work is a spirited if not altogether convincing defence of the Church of England against Dissent on the one hand and Romanism on the other.

The youngest of the four was *Thomas Sikes*, Vicar of Guilsborough. Although a man of learning and culture, Sikes buried himself in his Northamptonshire parish, and was only known to a few intimate friends.‡ Amongst them his vicarage became almost a place of pilgrimage, for his friends were always glad to avail themselves of his hospitality, to enjoy his ever-delightful company, and to discuss the affairs of the Church with him. Although Sikes moved about but little, he was fully alive to the problems of the day; and his remarkable prophecy of a revival in Churchmanship which Pusey got hold of was by him thought worthy to be passed on to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1842. The prophecy is in some ways so penetrating and so accurate that it is worth quoting some passages from it.§

"Wherever I go about the country," he said, "I see amongst the clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men, many of them much in earnest and wishing to do good. But I have observed one universal want in their teaching: the uniform suppression of one great truth. There is no account given anywhere, so far as I can see, of the one Holy Catholic Church. . . . Now this great truth is an article of the Creed; and if so, to teach the rest of the Creed to its exclusion must be to destroy 'the analogy or proportion of the faith.' This

* When Vicar of North Bradley he gave £3,000 towards the rebuilding of the Vicarage, and himself built a new Mission Church at a cost of £4,000.

† The term "free Church" referred then, of course, to a church in which the sittings were free of charge, not the doctrine free of episcopacy.

‡ He was brother-in-law to Joshua Watson (see below), and was in close touch with the "Hackney phalanx." He was visited by John Jebb in 1824.

§ See *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, by E. B. Pusey, 1842, and quotations in Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, vol. i., pp. 257-8. Compare Churton's *Memoir of Joshua Watson*.

cannot be done without the most serious consequences. The doctrine is of the last importance and the principles it involves of immense power; and some day, not far distant, it will judicially have its reprisals. . . . We now hear not a breath about the Church; by and bye those who live to see it will hear of nothing else. . . . And woe betide those, whoever they are, who shall, in the course of Providence, have to bring it forward. . . . Those who will have to explain it will hardly know where they are, or which way they are to turn themselves. They will be endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted. There will be one great outcry of Popery from one end of the country to the other. It will be thrust upon minds unprepared and upon an uncatechised Church."

Sikes, like those whom we have been considering, wrote a book on the Church. It is called *A Discourse on Parochial Communion*, and was published in 1812. Although it is dull, long, argumentative, and packed with much unnecessary quotation, it contains some not uninteresting ideas.

All these four writers were driven by the state of the times to think out more carefully what was the position which the Church really held. The conclusions to which they arrived were, summarily, these: The Church, being clearly of our Lord's foundation, is the God-given road towards Salvation. Daubeny writes of the Church almost as an insurance agent might write of his Society: "We hesitate not to say that there is absolute security in the Church for every sound member of it; and that we know of no security out of it." Jones, though less offensively dogmatic than Daubeny, wrote: "We see that the promises of God are confined to the ordinances of the Church; and that there can be no assurance of salvation without them." Again, Daubeny describes the Church as "the spiritual association which draws the line between those who are living without God, and consequently without hope, and those formally admitted into a covenant with him." "Taken in this light," he says, "the Church on earth may be considered as a preparatory stage in the road to man's future happiness; it being a school of discipline established by Christ, for the purpose of making every member of it meet for the possession of his heavenly inheritance." Their doctrine, then, was that of *nulla salus extra ecclesiam*; or, as Jones puts it: "If we are out of the Church, how can we be saved?"

As to the nature of the Church itself, they were quite clear in their own minds that the Church of England was a definite reformed branch of the Catholic Church, bearing in her ministry, her preaching, and her sacraments the three marks of orthodoxy. Sikes indeed quite definitely speaks of "Apostolic Succession,"

though both Jones and Daubeny had only hinted at it. If then the Catholic Church of England is the divine path towards Salvation, those who depart from it or reject it must be not only foolish but positively sinful. Hence "the Sin of Schism" becomes a favourite phrase with her advocates, though Jones, in his kindly way, prefers to speak of the "uncharitableness of schism."

It is difficult to say what effect these various works had upon their generation. Daubeny's *Guide* certainly ran through two or three editions, though Stevens' *Essay* was little noticed and Sikes' book almost unknown. Jones' *Essay* was swallowed up in one of the twelve volumes of his collected works, only to rise once more to fame on the back page of some of the *Tracts for the Times*, where it is recommended as a work of merit.

III

These four champions of the Church were closely connected both by blood and by sympathies with that little community of God-fearing and devout Churchmen whom Dr. William Hales, Rector of Killessandra in Ireland, called "the Hackney Phalanx." The "Surrey side" had already become famous for the circle of Evangelicals known as the "Clapham sect"; the High Churchmen of North London were therefore dubbed the "Clapton sect" in more or less direct imitation. Clapham, the home of Wilberforce, Zachary Macaulay, Henry Thornton and the rest, has survived in general knowledge; Clapton, in fact no less remarkable for good works, is now forgotten.

The most remarkable member of the "Hackney Phalanx" was *Joshua Watson*. He, like Stevens, was a pious London merchant, abounding in energy, and prepared, and indeed anxious, to spend his time, his interest and his money in the cause of the Church. Living until 1855, he saw the first stage of the Oxford Movement; and though disapproving of much that was said by the Tractarians, he naturally delighted in the prospect of the Church reawakening to its responsibilities and its sense of catholicity. While deeply impressed with the "zeal, learning and talents of the Oxford men," he thought that they needed guidance, especially as, he confessed, their demands seemed at times to be "not those of the human heart, but of the imagination of enthusiastic and ascetic and morbid-minded men." But behind what he recognized as the inevitable extravagances of a new outburst of feeling, Watson saw "much more to hope for than to fear in the present signs of the Church," and had the deepest sympathy with the effects of the Movement in the revival of

patristics, the study of Church history, increased services, and greater care of God's house.

Watson, as we have said, was the most active supporter of almost any cause connected with the Church; in fact, there were few societies with which he was not closely associated, and few schemes of philanthropy which did not look to him for advice and support. Among the good works to which he was attached were the National Society (of which he was a joint founder), the S.P.C.K., S.P.G., Additional Curates Society; Bishop's College, Calcutta; St. Augustine's, Canterbury; the Sons of the Clergy and the Society for Building Free Churches. Besides these many causes we find him collecting money for the relief of the Germans after the ravages of Napoleon, providing Greek Christians with cheap reprints of the early Fathers, endowing libraries in Iceland, and sending money for the relief of sufferers from a hurricane in the West Indies and for the poor in Ireland in the famine of 1847. He was unwearied in supporting poor clergy and their relations; he laboured to provide separate rooms for aged married couples in the workhouses; and even accepted the services of a Mr. Job Jeffkins, keeper of a spirit-shop in Shoreditch, to help him in the work of redeeming labourers' clothes and tools from the pawnbrokers! Besides all this, Watson built a church at Homerton and spent considerable sums in providing churches with new font ewers and special waste pipes to carry the water blessed in Holy Baptism straight into the ground instead of into the town drains.

The above list should leave no doubt of the softness of Mr. Watson's heart. It shows also that, though he may have thought but little about the nature of the Church, it was to him a Society so great and so holy as to call forth his whole attachment and loyalty. A most lovable man was Joshua Watson, and one whose name many may remember with gratitude.

His elder brother, *J. J. Watson*, for forty years Rector of Hackney, and also for a time Archdeacon of St. Albans, was a man who attracted far less public notice. The cause of this was not that he was in any real sense a less able man than his more distinguished brother, but that, being a most conscientious parish priest, he found, like most men of that profession, that his time was fully occupied with a large and important parish. The brothers, living within a few minutes' walk of one another, were in continual intercourse, and doubtless sought each other's advice on ecclesiastical problems. Evidence of the hold which the kindly and amiable High Church Rector had established upon his parishioners is shown by the fact that the houses and shops of both Churchmen and Dissenters were closed upon the day of his funeral.

A more interesting person was *Henry Handley Norris*, the son and grandson of wealthy London merchants, and first perpetual curate and then Rector of South Hackney. Born to wealth and endowed with great charm and ability, he was content to labour among the people of S. Hackney, near to his brother-in-law, J. J. Watson, refusing (it was said) every Bishopric that fell vacant during the Premiership of Lord Liverpool from 1812-1827, and himself familiarly known as "Patriarch" and "Bishop-maker."

Like Joshua Watson, he was an active supporter of any charity connected with the Church, was most liberal in the use of his money in both private and public benefactions, and was one of the two founders of the National Society and its first Honorary Secretary. Certainly of a more combative nature than the serene Rector of Hackney, he fought tooth and nail for the establishment of sound Catholic principles in the Church. "I want," he wrote in 1809 to J. J. Watson, "I want to see a centre formed to which every zealously-affected Churchman may resort and counterplot the numerous and most subtle devices against our very existence which every day is bringing to light . . . and wherever I find a sound Churchman I will lay violent hands upon him if I can." Though Norris may not have succeeded to any great extent in this scheme, it is an interesting prognostication of the meetings of the Tractarians first at Hadleigh and then at Oxford, and their journeys round the country delivering the first *Tracts for the Times* in the hopes of arousing the earnestness of the clergy.

The "Hackney Phalanx" represents a later stage than the four writers whom we first considered. The earlier writers set themselves to defend the Church's position not as in danger of being interfered with by the State, but of being totally deserted in favour of the new meeting-houses which were springing up with such alarming rapidity, though Sikes, the last of the four, has a chapter on Episcopacy not unlike the views of Newman in *Tract I*. On the other hand, the Clapton sect took the Church for granted and were only anxious that it should command the respect and support of good Englishmen in days when it was being violently and scurrilously attacked by those who regarded it as a rich and tyrannous organization concerned only with amassing vast revenues and seizing political power. It was the humble, devoted lives of such men as the Hackney Community and their many good works (more especially the creation of the National Society for the Education of the Poor) which gave the lie to the sort of charges published in the *Extraordinary Black Book* of 1830.

IV

Jones, Stevens, Daubeny and Sikes had seriously thought out what they meant by Churchmanship, and the "Hackney Phalanx" had tried to live it out. Their books were, probably, *livres de circonstance* occasioned by the separation of the Wesleyans and the anti-clerical agitation. When we turn to *Alexander Knox* we find a writer, a layman, with no particular axe to grind, an Irish Churchman who was prepared to examine any rational point of view, who was anxious to give both Romanists and Dissenters their due, and who yet came down a convinced Anglican, passionately devoted to the Book of Common Prayer, and to all that the Church of England stands to maintain.

Knox was born at Londonderry in 1757, but lived most of his life in Dublin. A man of independent means, with sedentary tastes and poor health, he lived the life of a recluse in his rooms in Dawson Street, occasionally paying visits to friends in Ireland, and once making an expedition to England. He was quite without ambition, and published nothing of note during his life, though his papers were published posthumously as four volumes of *Remains*. Besides these, two volumes of correspondence with his friend and disciple John Jebb were published in 1834, three years after his death. Alexander Knox's sole interest was in theology.* In his youth he had been a close and beloved friend of John Wesley, who wrote frequently to him as "My dear Alleck." This friendship with Wesley naturally made him sympathetic towards his followers, even when they left his beloved Church. But Knox was essentially a kindly man and genuinely interested, and without bias, in any doctrinal or ecclesiastical position. We shall find therefore in his writings a toleration of other points of view which is singularly lacking in, for example, Daubeny, whom Knox called "a strange kind of clergyman at Bath," and "a High Church bigot."

To write a biography of Knox would be impossible, for nothing of interest ever happened to him. His sole interest is in the six volumes which contain his thoughts; but these six volumes must be recognized as of an unusual nature. They contain mostly letters, some of them of prodigious length, and a few memoranda upon subjects which interested him. Being occasional writings we find much repetition and some confusion; but his position is, on the whole, easy to establish.

In a letter to a friend, written in March, 1806, Knox thus de-

* He was for a time secretary to Lord Castlereagh, but during the disturbances in Dublin in 1798 he found the task so uncongenial that he soon abandoned it to devote himself to what his editor called "the cultivation of revealed truth."

fines his position: "Now I am a Churchman in grain: not a Tory Churchman, for that is a disease in the Church, not its constitutional turn; nor yet a Whig Churchman, for they did not value enough the distinguishing features of our Establishment. But, if I may use the term, I am a primitive Churchman, prizing in our system, most cordially, what it has retained from Christian antiquity, as well as what it has gained from the good sense of the Reformers. . . . The truth is, I am not one whit puritanic; I love Episcopacy, the surplice, festivals, the communion-table set altarwise, antiphonal devotions." On another occasion he wrote: "I seem to myself to be continually rising on that fair hill, which Providence has set me upon, and given me the ambition to scale. And I almost think, that, as I rise, the horizon grows wider, and, in some degree, more luminous." Knox, then, was an eclectic—but this did not throw him into a position of mere picking and choosing; and Keble, who was so annoyed at this eclecticism,* ought to have realized his unassailable devotion to the Anglican Church. It was not the indefiniteness but the tolerance of Knox's creed which made him *persona non grata* to the Tractarians.

Knox was a kindly and tolerant man with a genuine desire to see the best in other schools of thought. He had been a great friend of John Wesley—"my venerable old friend" is how he speaks of him—and he knew how much he owed to that friendship. Consequently he looked upon "wesleianism" with sympathetic eyes. He used to attend their "conference breakfasts" in Dublin, and was frequently at their meeting-houses. As to their preaching, he thought that it contrasted favourably with the general standard of Anglican sermons. He writes in 1802: "It is strange and lamentable; but I verily believe the fact to be, that except among Methodists and methodistical clergymen, there is not much interesting preaching in England. . . . I felt real pleasure, last Sunday evening, in being one of a large congregation where, I can bear witness, the preacher did, at once, speak the words of truth and soberness. There was no eloquence: the honest man never dreamed of such a thing. But there was far better; a cordial communication of vitalized truth. I say vitalized, because what he declared to others it was impossible not to feel he lived on himself. . . . [Contrast this with] the dry details of meagre morality which are pronounced from most parochial pulpits." At the same time he is prepared to admit

* "Surely," wrote Keble, "it is rather an arrogant position in which Mr. Knox delighted to imagine himself, as one on the top of a high hill, seeing which way different schools tend (the school of Primitive Antiquity being but one among many), and passing judgment upon each, how far it is right, and how well it suited its time—himself superior to all, exercising a royal right of eclecticism over all" (Coleridge's *Memoir of Keble*, p. 242. Quoted in Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, i., 261).

their narrowness, just as the leaders of the Oxford Movement might be accused of narrowness. "Let them see," he writes, "that all goodness does not belong to their society; but that one unconnected with them may be just as strict and pious, even in the most tempting situation, as themselves." He disapproves strongly of the habit of denouncing the Wesleyans from Church pulpits, being "persuaded that the methodists, as a body, the wesleians I mean, deserve far more credit for what they believe rightly, than censure for what they think erroneously." For, he says again, "I look upon the substance of methodism to be identical with the central nucleus of Christianity." Thus on doctrinal points and on the score of usefulness and sincerity Knox has only praise for the Methodists, and he even entertains hopes of keeping them within the Church; and, at a time when Church writers were denouncing them as Schismatics and therefore sinners, Knox was saying: "Though I must deem them irregular, I cannot deem them schismatical."

Here, then, at any rate, we have an honest attempt to understand and appreciate a movement which had frightened most Churchmen into wild denunciations. No wonder that Keble thought Mr. Knox an "arrogant eclectic." On the other hand, what is Knox's attitude towards Romanism? Living in Ireland he had every opportunity of seeing both the best and the worst of the Roman system.

"The Romish Church," he writes, with peculiar understanding, "is like a garden overrun with weeds; but there are in this garden some old fruit trees which bear fruit of extraordinary mellowness." And again: "Viewed from without nothing could be more uncouth or revolting; but, under that rubbish, must be all the rich results of a providential training of Christ's mystical kingdom for fourteen centuries." Again he refers to the Roman Catholic Church as "that wonderful concrete of truth and error, of greatness and meanness, of beauty and deformity." It is the historical side of Romanism, those "old fruit trees," which especially appeals to him; its continuity, its respect for the past, its love of the Fathers, its devotion to the Saints. "The culture of ancient faith and piety," he says, "which has been kept up in it, covers, in my eyes (though it does not do away) a multitude of sins." There were not many Anglicans before Newman who would have written in terms so appreciative.

To the Church of England Knox owed an allegiance as unswerving as it was rational. A man of deep thought, he was not content to accept any creed which he had not closely examined; but of the Anglican Church he writes: "In sober, solid verity, there never was, except where God Himself was pleased to act personally, so good-natured and delightfully wise a

system as that of the Church of England. . . . No Church on earth has more intrinsic excellence." This devoted attachment to the Church is based upon two considerations: that it is truly a branch of the Catholic Church, and that it has been delivered from the errors which attach to other branches. "Our vitality as a Church," he writes, "consists in our identity of organization, and of mental character, with the Church Catholic: and, as our unbroken episcopacy implies the first, our Liturgy, and that alone (because an actual effluence of the 'catholic religion'), contains the other." "I love," he says, "that which identifies [the Church of England] with the Church Universal, rather than that which distinguishes it as a particular establishment." And again: "I am in the habit of maintaining that [the Church of England] is not Protestant, but a reformed portion of the Church Catholic." On the subject of the Reformers, he writes: "They were led to adopt *a medium* between the Protestants and the unreformed Church. They rejected alike the moral anarchy of one, and the mental slavery of the other."

This last thought brings Knox very near to the theory of the *Via Media* of the Church of England to which Newman devoted so much attention. But it was really Knox's disciple *John Jebb*, Bishop of Limerick, who had prepared the ground. Jebb was one who owed his theological position almost entirely to Knox, but who was prepared at times to go a little further than his master. In the Appendix to his *Sermons on Subjects chiefly Practical* (1814) he desires "to exhibit more clearly the agreement between the English Church and the Catholic apostolic Church of ancient times." He then argues, as Knox had taught him to do, that the Bible alone is not a sufficient guide, but must be supplemented by "Catholic tradition," the *consensus omnium*, the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus credendum est* of St. Vincent of Lerins. "The Church of England," he concludes, "steers *a middle course*. She reveres the Scripture: she respects tradition. She encourages investigation: but she checks presumption. She bows to the authority of ages: but she owns no living master upon earth. She rejects, alike, the wild extravagance of unauthorised opinion, and the tame subjection of compulsory belief."

Knox and Jebb were thinkers who, at a time when party feeling ran high, when wild and often stupid things were said about religious systems, were content to think out carefully what was the essence of the Anglican position. "I have good hope," writes Jebb to Knox in 1814—"I have good hope that, even now, some beneficial effect has been produced among those who wish well to our hierarchical establishment. . . . And perhaps, too, a little of persecution, or of somewhat resembling persecu-

tion, may be providentially permitted, to train up men with an attachment towards the Church, as a hierarchy as distinct from the State; and as dignified only by its intrinsic excellence, by its venerable antiquity, and by its apostolic institution." Twenty years later John Henry Newman in the first of the celebrated *Tracts* took up the task just where Alexander Knox and John Jebb had laid it down.

V

Professor Stokes, writing on Alexander Knox in the *Contemporary Review* in August, 1887, referred to him as "the idol of the Tractarians," and tried to establish a link between Wesley and Newman *via* Knox. He certainly went too far, and was immediately attacked by Dean Church in the *Guardian*. A rather desultory correspondence between the two continued for some weeks, Stokes trying to maintain what was really an indefensible theory against a man who had the strongest ties of personal attachment to the leaders of the Oxford Movement. Dean Church felt that he owed almost everything to the Oxford Movement, and was inclined to undervalue the preliminary work which had been done by thinkers of the preceding seventy years. On the other hand, Knox was in no sense "the idol of the Tractarians." In the lists of authorities published with the *Tracts*, amongst those we have been considering, only the names of Jones and Jebb are thought worthy to be included.

But though the Tractarians may have been unwilling to acknowledge any great obligation to their immediate predecessors, the fact cannot be ignored that much serious and enlightened thought had been put in during those preceding years, thought which could not fail to prepare the ground for that great movement which was to change the whole aspect of the Church of England. When we read the history of the Catholic Revival—as perhaps some will now be doing for the first time—we are often led to suppose that it was all "something new." Dean Church's admirable and really sympathetic and even moving History of the Movement is, in spite of its many excellent qualities, partly to blame for this. It needs, therefore, to be made quite clear that the "novelty" of the Movement was a novelty of method rather than any novelty of thought. Certainly Newman and his confederates developed lines of thought to conclusions which might have shocked even the most enlightened of earlier writers; but the main points which we associate with that great revival of Church life were quite clear to the minds of men like Alexander Knox. The greatest triumph of the Oxford Movement was to make men realize anew the

privileges and responsibilities of Churchmanship as well as the Catholic foundation of the Church of England. They succeeded also in giving men a new sympathy towards that totally misunderstood institution, the Church of Rome.* They drove men to the study of primitive Christianity, to familiarity with the Fathers of the Church, to a new conception of Sacramental worship, and to greater respect for the House of God. But if we suppose that there was anything intrinsically "new" in this we ignore the lives and work of those whom we have now been considering.

Everyone is now talking of the Oxford Movement, and we are about to celebrate the centenary of the "Assize" Sermon, which is generally taken to mark its beginning. It will be historically inaccurate, as well as morally unjust, if we forget or ignore those who, in the very difficult and trying years before, had given of their best, in thought, word and deed, to arouse the consciences of Churchmen to a closer allegiance to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church which they professed so frequently in their Creed, but showed forth so seldom in their lives.

J. R. H. MOORMAN.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Besides histories of the Oxford Movement, the following works have been consulted: Overton's *English Church in the Nineteenth Century*; Cornish's *History of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century*; Hunt's *Religious Thought in England*; Liddon's *Life of E. B. Pusey*; William Jones' *Works* published in 12 volumes in 1801 and *Life* by Stevens; *Memoirs of William Stevens*, by J. A. Park; Daubeny's *Guide to the Church*, 3 volumes, 1798-9; Sikes *On Parochial Communion*, 1812; E. Churton's *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, 2 volumes, 1861; Works by H. H. Norris on the Jesuits and on the Jews; Alexander Knox's *Remains*, 4 volumes, 1834; and reprint, *The Grace of Sacraments*, edited by Archbishop Maclagan in 1905; Jebb's *Thirty Years' Correspondence with Alexander Knox*, 2 volumes, 1834, and *Sermons, with Appendix*, 1814; the *Contemporary Review* and the *Guardian* for 1887, and the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

* The following incident is so remarkable as to be worthy of record. Jebb made great friends with the local Roman Catholic priest in his village, calling him "a treasure of a young priest." During the disturbances of 1821 Jebb was invited to speak in the Roman church. After Mass on a Sunday morning in January Jebb went to the church, was introduced as "the clergyman of the parish who would address them from the Altar," and talked for half an hour to a most attentive congregation; "a transaction," he says, "the like of which, I suppose, never occurred since the Reformation" (*Thirty Years' Correspondence*, vol. ii., p. 455).

THE "LUX MUNDI" SCHOOL AS CONTINUATORS OF THE TRACTARIAN SOCIOLOGY

WE have seen* that it was of the essence of the Tractarian aim to reassert the Church's claim to primacy in regard of the State, and therefore to restate the Catholic doctrine of the world as a creation of God and the subject of redemption, as well as fallen and the Christian's enemy. On the first point Tractarianism was opposing so-called Liberalism: a philosophy of life which was equivalent to secularism, and carried departmentalism to the extent of ignoring any relationship between religion and the social order. Religion was held to concern the soul and the next world (in neither of which did Liberalism greatly believe), while secular life concerned the attainment of wealth, happiness and freedom. On the second point Tractarianism was specially opposing the Evangelicalism which acquiesced in this division of territory. It was, however, on the whole, and in spite of Froude and Ward, unable to see the State otherwise than in terms of the Tory tradition of government from above, and obedience the sole duty of the subject. And in spite of Ward, who indignantly demanded a tribunate of the Church on behalf of the victims of industrialism, and of Pusey, who with prophetic fire denounced a people blood-guilty of the miseries of the poor; in spite also of Newman's recognition of covetousness as the sin and disgrace of the age, the movement did not succeed in defining a duty of society to control the economic man. Its hands were perhaps too full with the immediate necessity of contending for the idea of the Church, for the maintenance of the Faith, for the revival of worship, and for the actual feeding, teaching and nursing of the poor to allow it to attempt to reverse the engines of the politics and economics of the day. It was not the Tory tradition which hindered the development of a Catholic Sociology, for be it remembered that it was in the name of Toryism that Kingsley and Maurice announced the kinship of Christianity with Socialism. "The real battle of the time is—if England is to be saved from anarchy and unbelief, and utter exhaustion caused by the competitive enslavement of the masses . . . the Church, the gentleman, and the workman, against the shopkeepers and the Manchester School. The battle could not have been fought forty years ago, *because the Church was an idle phantasm*, the gentleman too ignorant, the workman too merely animal," wrote Kingsley in 1852. He might have said

* In two articles on "The Social Outlook of the Tractarians," published in THEOLOGY for June and July, 1932.

twenty years ago, so far as the Church was concerned. To have made the Church once again a living force was a sufficient day's work for a tiny, despised and persecuted minority.

It is commonly said that it is from F. D. Maurice that the revived social interpretation of the Incarnation and the Sacraments derives. This is partly but not altogether true. Maurice influenced Westcott on the one hand and Stewart Headlam on the other, and both of these exerted influence on Charles Gore.* But—though we shall know more of the origins when the authoritative Life of Gore is written—it would seem from the biographies of Scott Holland and Illingworth that independent thought in the light of the Catholic faith along the lines of the philosophy of T. H. Green was the actual *nidus* of *Lux Mundi*. The contribution of R. W. Church has perhaps hardly received recognition. He is quoted in several of the *Lux Mundi* essays—in those on *The Christian Doctrine of God*, *The Holy Spirit and Inspiration*, and *The Church*, as well as in those on *Politics* and *Ethics*. He it was, in fact, who carried over the wider view from the Tractarian to the later Oxford Movement. Moreover, he definitely raised the question of a Catholic Sociology, whereas Liddon—the other name which stands out from the intellectual point of view at this period—was typical of the narrowing outlook resulting from failure of the Tractarian group to get its implied doctrine translated into terms of the new, democratic, scientific age.

The generation that was growing up round about the year 1890 well remembers the sense of enormous relief and liberation which *Lux Mundi* and Gore's Bamptons brought to it. Before those publications, embodying the results of the intellectual battle fought out, for themselves first, by the "gang of Oxford donlets" of Holland's Holy Party, to hold on to the Christian faith was to be on the defensive against the thought of the age. Enthusiasm for the scientific pursuit of truth, for the historic sense, for democracy and Socialism, was all around them. But it seemed that there was a hopeless barrier between "following truth whithersoever it might lead them" and accepting the authority of Him who claimed to be the Truth, as represented by the Church which claimed to speak with His voice. The *Lux Mundi* group changed all that. The thought of the age was incorporated in the Christian mind, and became itself a vehicle for Catholic apologetic. "All things are yours," said Gore in his Bamptons, and the message thrilled his hearers with delight. It was the doctrine of the Incarnate *Logos* which became central, and it was that to which the Tractarian theology

* "When the House was opened straightway Headlam came.
Wasn't that a pretty thing to do in Pusey's name!"

had failed to give its whole value. Tractarian theology had remained largely within the old Evangelical circle of thought—the soul, sin and redemption. To this it had added the idea of the Church as the sphere, the Sacraments as the means of redemption. But *Lux Mundi* cast back behind redemption to creation. "The world is the poem of the Word to the glory of God the Father." The phrase is Dean Inge's, but it expresses the revived Catholic doctrine of the world and of man. Evolution is accepted as the work of the *Logos* through whom all things were made. History, including the present moment, since it incorporates His Life, manifests His Light. Science—geological, with its throwing-back of the age of the world; biological, with its declared origins of species and of man; critical, with its historical categories—is from Him because it is an instrument of truth. Democracy, a present fact of history, can be seen as interpreting the worth of personality and the brotherhood of man. Socialism, again a fact which was actually changing the face of society, illuminates the idea of authority as making it a claim of the corporate whole upon the individual member. But above all, only the idea of the Incarnation, of the Word personally entering to fulfil, and therefore to redeem, the world-order He was creating, could, with its extension in the Church and the sacramental system, interpret and validate the life of individual and society. A younger generation, faced by the need to proclaim the Church's right and duty to give direction to society out of her own treasure of wisdom, may declare that "*Lux Mundi* gave too much away to the *Zeitgeist*." But the Church cannot give direction to a society with which it is not related, which it merely stands outside and over against. What needed to be done, and was done, at that time, was to recognize in the *Zeitgeist* the Spirit of God striving for expression through a partly refractory, partly distorted, medium; the Word working on the level of creation to meet His own fuller work on the level of regeneration; the immanent Divine stretching up to the touch of God transcendent.*

The *Lux Mundi* theology was thus of one piece with the *Lux Mundi* sociology; though, as Gore said not long before his death, "You must not imagine that all the *Lux* group cared about the social question—really only three or four of us did"; and though this "not caring" has persisted throughout the forty years that have followed, so that while the general intellectual outlook has long passed into the common mind of the Church, Gore was still complaining at the end, as at the beginning, that the Church

* Illingworth's *Divine Immanence* beautifully worked out the doctrine on these lines.

lies under the reproach of having "transferred the strain of Christian obligation from the Life to be lived to the creed to be believed."

Nevertheless, the *Lux Mundi* essays, proclaiming in their Preface their desire, not merely "to welcome and give its place to all new knowledge" but to see the Church "throw herself into the sanctification of each new social order," included two definitely on the subjects of *Christianity and Politics* and *Christian Ethics*. Both are interesting bits of pioneer work towards that re-discovery of Catholic sociology which Dean Church had demanded. The interesting points in the essay on *Christian Politics* (by W. J. H. Campion) are the historical treatment of the subject—the emphasis of the teaching is shown to vary with the conditions of the age in which it is given,* while the principles remain fixed—and its own historical reactions. Social democracy is for the writer the current form of political thought, and he is concerned to show how it needs for its own health certain corrective principles which the Church can supply. In particular, we find already sounded the note of protest against the tendency to claim ultimate moral authority for the state. Campion points out the danger of this to liberty of conscience and to civil liberty itself, and the consequent value to the political order of the Church's counter-claim. He finds here a characteristic form for this age of that "kind of religious tribunate" which has been traditional in the Church in varying forms from the fourth century onwards. R. L. Ottley's essay on *Christian Ethics*, it is noted in the Preface, is "the only one which has any degree of formal completeness," as being on "a subject on which the absence of systematic books of a genuine English growth seems to justify a more detailed treatment." It finds the Christian ethic to be essentially social, having the Kingdom of God as its regulative idea and final end. But its distinctive thought is the recognition of the Moral Law as the Mind of God expressed in the Person of Christ, and moral action as the simple expression of a personality in right (filial) relation to God. It is directed by faith, effective through hope, and spontaneous in love. Under God it is wise, towards the world it is just—"the order of human society, human law, the state, the Church: all this, into which the science of politics inquires, forms part of the obligation involved in love to man"—towards self it is disciplined. Everywhere it has fortitude, active and passive. The blessed life "thus means that state wherein, by a society of renewed personal beings, the Highest Good is loved and enjoyed."

The addition of an Appendix *On Some Aspects of Christian*

* He goes so far at one point as to say that the theologians of the Middle Ages "supplemented" St. Paul's teaching.

Duty rather suggests that the essay was felt to be somewhat academic in form. A variety of current topics are noted as demanding the application of Christian principles. For example, "as to the social sphere generally," a Christian theory of rights and duties is required.* "The prevailing view of them is individualistic." Again, "the moral culture of Imagination," and "the education of feeling and character," and of public opinion, as well as exposition of the Christian mind on the family, are points of importance.

In addition to these two full-length studies in Christian sociology,† there is a passage in Francis Paget's essay on *Sacraments* of marked significance for our purpose. It takes up again a hint which we saw thrown out by Newman; and doubtless it was connected with the teaching of Stewart Headlam and Charles Marson.

"There is a profound far-reaching import in the fact that material and visible means are thus hallowed to effect the work of God, to bear His unseen grace. . . . Its surpassing glory is in its primary and essential character, as the regular employment of visible means for the achievement of Divine mysteries. For thus our whole estimate of this world is affected. . . . Through sacramental elements and acts Christianity maintains its strong effective hold upon the whole of life. The consecration of material elements to be the vehicles of Divine grace keeps up on earth that vindication and defence of the material against the insults of sham spiritualism which was achieved for ever by the Incarnation and Ascension of Jesus Christ. . . . It thus appears that the unreal spirituality which consists of a barren and boastful disparagement of ritual observance or of outward acts, of earthly relationships or of secular life, of natural feelings or of bodily health, clashes with Christian teaching as sharply as it does with human nature and with common sense."

It is the sacramental principle, which is also the principle of the Incarnation, that explains and consecrates the whole of life. Ten years later, in an article in the *Pilot* (reprinted as an appendix to his *Body of Christ*), Gore extended this idea by pointing out that it also implies the social order. The Sacraments are "ceremonies of a society," and that society itself, the Holy Catholic Church, is the sacrament of the universal human fellowship, the City of God, which is the purpose of God for mankind. "There is no divine fellowship except in human brotherhood"; salvation lies in the life of a community.

* It is noticeable that in the instances given the rights appear to be mostly on the side of labour, the duties on that of the capitalist.

† The phrase is used by Campion—"the relations of governors and governed looked at in the light of Christian anthropology and Christian sociology," p. 324 of tenth edition.

The year of the publication of *Lux Mundi* (1889) was also the year of the foundation of the Christian Social Union by the leaders of the same group. Its first object proclaimed again what we saw to be the motive behind the Tractarian Movement at the first, the recovery of the primacy of the spiritual in human society. In the C.S.U. phrase, this was "To claim for the Christian Law the ultimate authority to rule social practice." But now it was recognized that in new conditions the Law will have new application; and the second object was "To study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time." Nevertheless Christians no more than others dare wait to act till they are certain that they have complete intellectual justification; and if the second object demanded the rediscovery of Christian sociology, the third demanded that tribunate of which Campion's essay spoke: "To present Christ in practical life as the living Master and King, the enemy of wrong and selfishness, the power of righteousness and love."

It was, in fact, this third object rather than the other two for which the C.S.U. came to stand. Its great merit was its serious attempt to make the man in the pew understand what the social conditions of the day were, and that as a Christian he was concerned to remedy them. In Holland's words, it "voted urgency for the social question." In Gore's, it declared that a Christian should be unable "to be tolerant of the social order as it exists"; that there is "no shadow of question that if the mass of our communicants or half our communicants were in earnest about this matter the thing would be done—altered by that which alone can alter the condition of things in a stable society, namely, the existence of a great moral repulsion and the dawning of a great vision of something better." The thing that was thus to be done was "social reform" in detail—better houses, better education, abolition of sweating, provision for the unemployed. Christian public opinion was to put itself behind this and that demand for improvement in such things. It was necessarily opportunist, for the C.S.U. refused to accept (as the Guild of St. Matthew and the Church Socialist League did accept) the Socialist interpretation of the social order, and the revival of an authentically Christian interpretation was hardly yet envisaged. "I am far too ignorant and untrained for the work" (of directing such a society as C.S.U. was meant to be), wrote Holland to Talbot in 1894: "And there is a great deal to do; it tires me out. Yet I have absolutely no one to hand it over to. In my mild sort of way I just serve to mediate; that is all. I suppose light will come."

Plunged in the whole round of activities demanded of them as protagonists of a living and liberal Catholicism in an increasingly secular world and ecclesiastical Church, the leaders of the new School could by no possibility become experts in Christian sociology. Perhaps the most typical work they did as exemplifying the kind of research needed was the remarkable volume on *Property* published in 1914. Only Gore himself and Holland among the writers were in fact members of the *Lux Mundi* group; but it was Gore who demanded that the work should be done and, with Dr. Vernon Bartlet, organized the doing of it. Dr. Bartlet had suggested to Dr. Gore that they two should combine to issue some popular literature "urging on Christians the duty of reconsidering their ideas about property in the light of the Bible doctrine of stewardship." "Naturally," wrote Gore in his Introduction to the book, "I felt a cordial sympathy with the idea, but I said that before anything of a popular kind was issued, I thought we needed some more thorough or philosophical treatment of property in idea and history." To appeal to the individual to regard himself as a steward did not in fact enlighten him as to what his duty was. He stands within a certain actual system of property, and at every point he is limited in his action by it. He may feel that the system itself needs change. But he needs a principle, or philosophy of property, both to know in what direction change should go, and also as a basis for formation of a common mind which may become strong enough actually to bring change about. "It was this principle, this philosophy of property," said Dr. Gore, "in which, when I listened to Dr. Bartlet's appeal, I felt myself lacking." So a group of students was found to undertake research into Property; its historical evolution; its philosophical idea; the principle of private property; the Biblical and early Christian idea of property; the mediæval theory of it; the influence of the Reformation on ideas about it; and its relation to the fundamental Christian teaching on personality, and personality in fellowship. After reading these essays, said Gore, he felt he had got what he wanted: "a standing-ground on certain dominant ideas and constructive principles by which I can guide myself and feel assurance in seeking to guide others." What the actual principles were does not directly concern us here; the volume is cited as an example of the kind of work involved in the *Lux Mundi* demand for "an attempt to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems."

Gore himself was the chief continuator of *Lux Mundi* along the sociological line. Primarily his demand was upon the Church—upon the Christian, not upon the citizen. He

seized upon the point brought out in the Revised Version of *Acts*, that one of the oldest names for the Church was "the Way"—"a way of life for man," as he says in the Bamptons. "Christianity is, first of all, 'the Way.' It is a life—a social life to be lived. It is as a life, rather than a doctrine, that in the New Testament it makes its tremendous and difficult claim upon men," he reiterates thirty years later in *The Reconstruction of Belief*. Again, in *Christ and Society*, "Christianity is first of all a way of life for men in fellowship. The call of Christ was to live this life. The first name for the Church was 'the Way' . . . The object of the Church of Christ, as its Founder defined it, is to live a life, and that life an organized brotherhood."

It was to this corporate and distinctive life that he was so earnestly set to recall the Church. If she would only become what she ought to be, let her light shine, revive the distinctness of her savour, she would be representing Christ in the world by the method of Christ Himself. "Only when men have come to understand what the Christian moral standard is—in marriage and in the home, in commerce and in politics—and to understand that it can no more be dispensed with than the Creed or the Sacraments, is there any prospect of a healthy revival of church life" (*The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 50). For the Church is the symbol and sacrament of the life of man as it was meant by its Creator to be lived; and that is "the blessed life": "a life of perfect relationship with man and nature based on perfect fellowship with God"—so he sums up the meaning of the Beatitudes. Repeatedly he insists that to regain such an idea of the Church demands a movement as strong and determined as the Tractarian Movement itself. "The few Tractarians of sixty years ago by industry, patience, and prayer effected a kind of revolution in the Church as a whole; and reformers of Christian social relations may with the same weapons—and with no other—do the like."

But in order that this Life might be lived there was need for hard thinking as to the application of the Christian law in the industrial civilization of the day. "We want a new casuistry which will not be a statement of the minimum requirements, but an exposition of how Christians ought to act in the different departments of social life. This new casuistry will need to be formulated by voluntary effort in the first place, and might afterwards be taken into consideration by the authorities of the Church." "The first step to this is to form small consultative bodies of men who know exactly what life means in workshops, in different business circles, among employers of labour, among workmen; men who combine a profound practical Christianity with thorough knowledge of business ways";

so he wrote as long ago as 1892. A casuistry so formed would become the basis for a real "binding and loosing" by the Church, a revival of ecclesiastical discipline.

So far as Gore contemplated a relation of the Church to the outside world other than that of enlightening by shining, it was to be found in the prophetic office of the Church; and even so, the Church can declare to the world its duty only because the world is fundamentally Christian *in posse*. There is, he says, only one true social principle, "the principle of the sonship and brotherhood of man as based on the Fatherhood of God." This involves three main subordinate principles—"(*a*) The principle of justice—that each individual man is an end and not a mere means. . . . (*b*) The principle of trust in God's Fatherhood" —which is somewhat unexpectedly interpreted to mean "both the reality of responsibility and its limit. . . . That in commerce we shall resolutely do the will of God and abide by the consequences; in dealing with individuals, we shall not be more merciful than our Master, or attempt, as He did not attempt, to save men in spite of themselves. . . . We shall not be afraid of letting truth loose for fear of its causing havoc." (*c*) "The principle of co-operation, not competition. In every department of life Christians are to seek the good of all." It was these principles which condemned our society as it is, "a society which our Lord could look at with nothing else than those startling maledictions which are the most terrible things on His lips. The principles that dominate politics live in the moral heart of man, and there is the sphere in which the Church must act if it is to be true to its name."

Justice, responsibility, co-operation were thus defined by Gore as Church principles; and one other element was prominent in his social teaching: a genuine hatred of riches. His famous Church Congress sermon on *The Church and Wealth* partly expressed his mind on this matter. The Church of England is markedly unlike her Master in that while He in His Incarnate life chose to identify Himself with "the class accustomed to live hardly, and to depend for sustenance on daily labour," and "to this class gave the prerogative position in His Church," she is "the Church of the rich rather than of the poor," "works from above rather than from below," expresses "the opinions and the prejudices of the higher and higher middle classes, rather than of the wage-earners." But more profoundly than that, the whole *ethos* of Christ's teaching condemns a social mind which sets great store on material possession. "The Lord's warnings are reiterated against those who seek to become rich men. They can hardly escape perdition"; and while He does not absolutely condemn the mere possession of wealth, yet "He

stands over against each single soul that comes before Him to seek the position of the disciple, eliciting, claiming, welcoming and blessing its renunciation." Why? The sermon does not say: and in fact nowhere apparently does Gore say precisely why. He seems to suppose that the ideal, once stated, will approve itself. Beauty is good and knowledge is good, and wealth that subserves these, if it makes them a common possession, is good. But "the steady advance in comfort which material progress entails" is a dangerous because a coarsening thing. "False claims on life for enjoyments we should be the stronger for dispensing with; false ideals of vanity and display—these, and not our circumstances, are the hindrances to that largeness of heart and peace and liberty and joy which have their root only in the bare and naked relation of the soul to God."

The *Lux Mundi* School, then, made the idea of social ethics once again current coin in the Church. It got away from a static and external thought of Church authority and saw it rather as dynamic and pedagogic. It conceived the Church as interpreting to the age the Mind of God for it, but also as herself the living symbol of that "divine fellowship in human brotherhood" which is the purpose of God for man. It demanded from the Church a prophetic wrath against the cruelty, injustice and mammonism of the existing world-order, and also a labour of thought for the explication of the Christian ethic in detail in relation to each social function, political, economic, cultural. It laid down as fundamental to such a work the concepts of justice, responsibility, co-operation on the one hand; of the sacramental idea—the material as vehicle and expression of the spiritual—on the other. If today we stand in a world facing new and catastrophic conditions, and therefore need new insight and new drafts upon the old treasure, and a swifter work of application, yet in this body of thought we have a firm foundation on which to build.

RUTH KENYON.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT IN THE HISTORY OF ANGLICANISM

THE paper which I am to read to you this afternoon you will not expect to deal adequately with the remarkable Movement in the Church of England, the centenary of which, dated from the Assize Sermon preached by John Keble in St. Mary's Church in Oxford on July 14, 1833, is to be celebrated next year. All that I can attempt to do is to say something of its aims, something of its successes, something of its failures, and finally something

of the grounds on which the Church of England can reasonably be invited to rejoice and thank God on the remembrance of it.

First, then, as to the aims of the Oxford Movement. These may easily on a superficial view be misconceived; they were, as a matter of fact, at the time of its origination, widely misconceived. Certainly approximation to Roman Catholicism was not one of them. Unquestionably the Church of Rome came to exercise upon some of its followers a powerful attraction which drew many into the fold of that communion; and the man among its original leaders who possessed the greatest genius, the drama of whose religious life, unfolded in a style of delicate and haunting beauty and illustrated by a penetrating insight into human character and by an intellect of singular keenness and subtlety, continues after a hundred years to fascinate his readers, died, as we all know, a Roman cardinal. Yet even Newman, when the movement began, knew but little of Rome and was deeply prejudiced against what he knew or thought he knew of her; while as to the other two protagonists of the Oxford Movement, Newman himself testified, when after his own passage into her communion he was asked whether his former colleague, Pusey, was nearer to her than before, that he had never been near to her at any time; and Keble, whose type of piety may, I think, be truly said to have impressed itself upon the subsequent generation of Anglican clergy far more deeply and widely than that of either Newman or Pusey, was from first to last a loyal representative of a distinctively Anglican tradition, reaching back at last to the beginning of the seventeenth century, the exponents of which had, when they looked abroad for allies, been accustomed to seek them, not at Rome, but rather in the Eastern Churches which Rome called schismatic and which themselves called Rome heretical.

Nor again was the aim of the Oxford Movement primarily ritualistic. That it inspired a new care for and interest in religious ceremonial is true; that men and women of a ritualistic temperament were drawn into it and powerfully influenced its later development, is also true. But here again, its originators cared little for ceremonial in itself; and were led to value it only as it was the expression of doctrines which they had embraced on grounds quite other than their congruity with external splendour or even beauty. We shall, however, see that the opposition to a certain current of thought and feeling prevalent in this country a hundred years ago, an opposition which *was* a primary aim of the Movement, allied them from the first with contemporaries who were undoubtedly determined in their opposition to the same current of thought and feeling by a

repulsion to it, due to its failure to satisfy the demands of the æsthetic side of our nature.

What, then, was this current of thought and feeling in opposition to which the Oxford Movement arose? It was sometimes called by Newman "Liberalism," but this term may easily mislead us. It was, in fact, a current induced by the so-called Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, rationalistic and utilitarian, contemptuous of earlier ages, and especially of their religious and theological preoccupations, inclined to minimize the importance of religious differences, and to expect from the progress of mechanical invention, based upon the rapidly increasing knowledge of nature due to the successful employment of observation and experiment, a corresponding progress in human happiness and welfare. Representatives of this way of thinking and feeling were not indeed as a rule indifferent to morality; but their regard to it was determined by their belief in its tendency to promote individual happiness and social contentment; they had little sympathy with an anxious or passionate quest of holiness, inspired by the desire for personal communion with a holy God, or with an overwhelming sense of the hindrance which sin offered to satisfaction of such a desire.

In opposition to the current of thought and feeling which I have just been attempting to describe, the men of the Oxford Movement aimed at rousing the Church of England to the danger which it threatened to that whole "other-worldly" outlook (I use a convenient word of later coinage and use it, not in the bad sense which was perhaps that in which it was first employed by Coleridge) which had in earlier days been associated with Christianity and was—and indeed is—closely intertwined with the traditional language of Christian piety. I mean an outlook for which the whole of secular civilization with all its provision for human convenience and comfort, for "the relief of man's estate" on earth—together with the mighty frame of nature itself, the laws whereof, ascertained by scientific research, men sought to exploit for human benefit—was after all a thing of small account, which must at some time, and might at any moment, dissolve "like the baseless fabric of a vision" at the second coming of Christ, and give place to an order wherein beliefs and aspirations which it was the fashion with the "enlightened" world of the day to disregard as extravagant and out of date, would be found to determine the eternal destiny of every living soul. To judge fairly of the Oxford Movement, one must recognize that this outlook, however little it really dominated the interests and behaviour of most professing Christians in this country a hundred years since, was implied and even asserted in religious teaching given, and in the phraseology of devotion

employed in practically all the churches and chapels of the land; and was almost universally regarded as an integral part of the system of social life, supported by the laws and customs of the national constitution. Thus, if we are sometimes inclined to wonder that such a measure as the suppression of certain Irish bishoprics could be seriously regarded as a symptom of "national apostasy," we must bear in mind that it might quite reasonably be looked upon as illustrating the tendency to dissociate the State from an exclusive support of any religious creed or institution, a tendency which unquestionably characterized the whole history of Western civilization in the nineteenth century, however various the degrees to which this dissociation was carried in different countries; and that this tendency was inspired by the conviction that the "other-worldly" outlook, for which the Tractarians stood, was one which it could not be expected that every citizen should share, and which therefore ought not to influence the conduct of public affairs.

Besides, however, pointing out the general opposition offered by the men of the Oxford Movement to the rationalistic and utilitarian view of the world and of human existence which was at the period of its inauguration so prevalent in circles which pretended to enlightenment and so influential in the life of the nation, I must say a few words about the special characteristics distinguishing their opposition from that of contemporaries who shared in greater or less measure their discontent with that view.

We may, for convenience' sake, divide these contemporaries into two groups and call them for the moment the Romanticists and the Evangelicals. The Tractarian leaders were not unconscious of their affinities with some of the illustrious men who represented in this country the great movement of reaction against the rationalistic and (in the end) revolutionary "enlightenment" of the eighteenth century, which is often compendiously called the Romantic Movement, and of which, on the continent of Europe, Goethe, Chateaubriand, Schleiermacher, Hegel, and in Britain Scott, Wordsworth and Coleridge, Byron, Shelley and Carlyle were in their different ways representative figures. In Scott, who had recalled men's minds to sympathy with antique loyalties, and in Wordsworth, who had been the prophet of the dignity and sanctity of human life as lived in the presence of nature apart from the disturbing influences of theories and doctrines begotten of a superficial and restless curiosity and not rooted "deep in the general heart of man," where abides the power of the true poet, they recognized a spirit in many ways akin to that which they sought to arouse in the clergy and laity of the national Church of England. But, although no doubt the protest of the Oxford Movement against

rationalism and utilitarianism placed it in line with the larger movement, which, for want of a better name, is called Romantic, and which, through Scott and Wordsworth and Coleridge (whom indeed Carlyle chose to regard as the true father of Puseyism), exerted a real influence upon it, yet in the minds of its leaders it was definitely a protest, not on behalf of tradition in general, or of a spiritual interpretation of experience in general, still less of the rights of feeling in general or even of religious feeling in particular; but on behalf of the *Christian* tradition, of the *Christian* interpretation of experience, of the truth of the doctrines which justify the awe and loving reverence wherewith *Christians* were accustomed to regard the divine dispensation which they had learned from the Bible to acknowledge both in the history of the world and in the course of individual lives.

Here they were on the same ground with the Evangelicals. These too were engaged in protesting in the name of the Biblical and Christian view of life against rationalistic scepticism and contemptuous disregard of divergences in religious belief as a thing indifferent. The Archbishop of York went so far the other day as to say that the Oxford Movement was "rooted in" the Evangelical Movement which preceded it. We may recall that Newman experienced as a boy, under Evangelical influences, a conversion from which, even after his submission to Rome, he dated "the beginning of divine faith" in him; and the kinship of what Dr. Brilioth of Lund in his admirable book on the Movement, *The Anglican Revival*, has called Pusey's "tender theology of the Cross" with Evangelical teaching is unmistakable. But in two important respects the men of the Oxford Movement parted company with the Evangelicals. These were their individualism and what for the moment I may call their religiosity. Sincerely as the Evangelicals believed in the inspiration of the Bible, in the Atonement wrought by Christ's death, in the eternal destiny of human souls, articles of faith no less with the Tractarians than with them, they did not, speaking generally, envisage these truths as bound up with membership in a visible society, the authorized interpreter of the Bible, through the ministry of whose officers the benefits of the Atonement were sacramentally conveyed to individual Christians, and whose fellowship anticipated, however dimly, on earth, the society to the joys of which the believer looked forward as the prize of his calling in heaven. Corresponding with this individualistic character of the Evangelicals' religion went, so thought their critics, a certain sectarianism of temper; they affected a peculiar phraseology, and made certain feelings the test of true religion; while they appropriated the title of "Gospel," which antiquity had associated especially with the record of our Saviour's life, ex-

clusively to a theological theory of the mysterious efficacy of his death, gathered from St. Paul's Epistles, in comparison with which the morality which the universal conscience of men, even beyond the sphere of the Biblical revelation, had approved, and which the teaching of Christ had reinforced with a new authority, was despised as something unspiritual, belonging to a lower stage of religion which the truly converted man had transcended.

I am not prepared to contend that this is a fair and adequate account of Evangelicalism; but, as it was presented in the language and conduct of some circles which made their boast of it, and which exercised a wide influence in the English religious world of a hundred years ago, there was no doubt much to justify the Tractarians in their conviction that the battle in which they were themselves engaged against the rationalistic and utilitarian spirit abroad in the world could not be won by a form of religion which, on the one hand, shared to a great extent the neglect of tradition and authority which characterized that spirit itself, and, on the other, did not allow its true value to those convictions of the moral consciousness, to the witness of which the Scriptures and our Lord had not disdained to appeal, and which were the natural foundation on which alone the edifice of revealed religion could be securely built.

It was thus the aim of the Tractarians not in the least to deny the truth or the importance of the principal doctrines on which the Evangelicals of their day laid most stress, but to reincorporate them, as it were, in the larger system from which they had been, so to say, torn away; the inspiration of the Bible in that of the Church, which had first recognized the authority of the canonical writings and had handed them down as her credentials; the Atonement wrought by Christ's death in his Incarnation, there to be contemplated in intimate connection both with the life of which the death was the crowning scene and with the rising again "for our justification" to which it led up; and finally the Christian revelation as a whole in the providential guidance of human affairs which had never anywhere left men without the witness borne by nature and conscience to the existence and moral government of their Creator.

Of these reincorporations, it was inevitable that the one which would most occupy the energy of followers and most attract the attention of observers should be the first. For it involved an emphasis, to which English Churchmen of a century ago were unaccustomed, on the unity of the Christian Church throughout the world, the continuity of its ministry, the importance to the individual's life of participation in its sacraments: stress on these being also intimately associated with the new

theological orientation, whereby the Incarnation as a whole rather than the Atonement taken by itself was represented as the source of the grace which the Christian believes himself to receive from his Lord. Herein lay the ground of the profound transformation of the worship of the Church of England which the Movement was destined to effect; of the attraction exercised upon its followers by the great Roman communion which had sacrificed so much to the principle of the external unity of Christ's mystical body; and, lastly, of the widespread impression that the aim of the Movement was, by reintroducing ideas and practices abandoned at the Reformation in the sixteenth century, to refashion the bonds between the Church of England and the Roman See which had then been broken.

No doubt there has been, from the early days of the Oxford Movement, a certain measure, sometimes a large measure, of genuine Romanizing among its followers; but, upon the whole, the tendency of the Movement has been, as I have already observed, by no means Romeward. Three facts, I think, are sufficient to allege in support of this statement. In the first place, there can be no question that, for a large number of persons whose temperament causes them to find a fashion of worship in which dignity of ceremonial and a sense of mystery are lacking, inadequate and even repellent, the services of the Anglican Church, as reformed under the influence of the Oxford Movement, have met a need for which they would without these have been driven to seek satisfaction in those of the Roman Catholic. In the same way, to a smaller, but still not inconsiderable number of pious folk, to whom the experience of communion with God mediated through the frequent and regular use of sacraments is the most congenial form of religious life, the multiplication of eucharistic celebrations which the Church of England has owed to the Oxford Movement has made it unnecessary for them to seek outside its borders for the opportunities of sacramental worship which they so much desire. We shall shortly see that, in one respect, the Anglican Church, under the inspiration of the Oxford Movement, may even be said to have done more than the Roman Church in affording such opportunities.

In the second place, the *ethos* of the Anglican Church, even in those circles within it which have been permeated by the Spirit of the Oxford Movement, has remained, though doubtless very different from that of most other Protestant churches, yet also quite definitely different from that of the Roman communion. This difference will not, I think, be denied by anybody who is well acquainted with both, whichever he may prefer of the two spiritual atmospheres.

In the third place, that portion of the Anglican Church wherein Romanizing has gone furthest, and which may be fairly criticized as regardless of deliberate decisions taken by the Church of England in separating itself from Rome against certain doctrines and practices encouraged thereby, offers in the very extravagance of reliance on private judgment and impatience of restraint by authority which they display in their indifference to Anglican standards and traditions, the strongest possible contrast, for good or evil, to the highly centralized system of discipline maintained in the Roman Church of the present day.

I turn now from the aims to the successes of the Oxford Movement. It will, I think, be generally allowed that it has changed and, on the whole, changed for the better the outward face of religion in this country—and this by no means only in the National Church itself; that it has aroused and encouraged among religious people a care for order and decent reverence, a love of beauty and dignity in the accessories of worship, a readiness to use the arts of music, architecture, painting, sculpture in the service of the Church, which a hundred years ago were rare among us, and often suspect, as implying an unspiritual or even superstitious turn of mind in those who exhibited them.

The Movement has also created a new type of clergyman, and has at least powerfully affected the standards and ideals of clergymen who could not be numbered among its followers, and even of the ministers of other churches than the Anglican. Speaking generally, one may say that it substituted an interpretation of the taking of holy orders as a solemn sanctification of oneself for the sake of others, after our Lord's example, involving a personal and lifelong duty of priestly service, independent of the special requirements of any particular ministerial charge, for the interpretation of it as the adoption of a learned profession concerned with the working of the religious institutions of the country, just as the lawyer's is with that of the juridical; a profession with definite obligations, recognized by definite modes of remuneration, from the practice of which a man might retire as from any other, although, by the law of the land, accompanied by certain privileges (and also certain disqualifications) which do not cease with the active exercise of its functions. At the same time, the important fact that, speaking generally, the inheritors of the Tractarian tradition, even the most "extreme" among them, have never attempted to imitate Rome in insisting upon clerical celibacy, nor have clergymen of the party in practice abstained from marriage, has preserved the Anglo-Catholic portion of the Anglican ministry (I am using the word "Anglo-Catholic" in its earlier and wider sense, not reserving it, as is now common, for the extreme section of the

High Church party) from that segregation from the general life of the nation which is one of the most unfortunate results of enforced clerical celibacy where it obtains; while the revival of the "religious life," technically so called, for those with a special vocation thereto, both among men and women, has enriched the Church of England with institutions affording opportunities for special forms of work and worship, the disappearance of which at the Reformation, however inevitable under the circumstances of the time, was a real loss to the Church. Nor need the repairing of this loss imply any reversal of the great Reformation principle of a common moral standard for all Christians, so long as observance of the so-called "counsels" is regarded as something to which individuals may be called, as others to other particular modes of serving God, but not as intrinsically more Christian than the life of a married citizen and householder.

Beside the general improvement in the outward face of religion, in the ideals of the ministerial life, and in the provision of opportunities for the fulfilment of special vocations involving religious retirement from ordinary social life, which I should reckon as successes of the Oxford Movement, I would mention one particular matter of peculiar interest, in respect of which the Oxford Movement can boast of having, within certain limits, succeeded where the Reformers had, speaking generally, failed; namely, the establishment of a habit of frequent communion among the laity specially affected by its teaching. The Reformers found attendance at the Eucharist, altogether divorced from communion, the usual form of worship among the laity. Rightly considering this a perversion of the original institution, they would not allow the Eucharist to be celebrated when there was not a reasonable number of communicants; and there is no doubt that their object was to encourage the habit of communion more than once a year, which among the secular laity had practically disappeared. But the result was everywhere rather to make celebrations rare than to make communions frequent. The Oxford Movement has, however, notoriously succeeded in making celebrations *with* communion of the faithful far more frequent in those churches which inherit its tradition than they have probably been since primitive times in any great Church. Nor, even in those Anglican churches where there has been a revival of devotion to the reserved Sacrament which would not have been countenanced by the leaders of the Oxford Movement or by the earlier generation of their followers, has this revival, whatever doubts some of us may feel about it on other grounds, been accompanied by a tendency to teach that attendance at mass, even where this is strongly urged as a duty

on its own account, is a substitute for regular and not infrequent communion.

The mention of this success, with which the Oxford Movement may certainly be credited, of restoring to its devout followers not only frequent opportunities of that eucharistic worship which had been from apostolic times down to the Reformation the centre of Christian devotion, but also of that individual participation therein, according to the original institution, which in the Middle Ages had so largely fallen into disuse, leads me to the mention of a contrasting failure.

While, within a certain restricted circle, in the main (though by no means exclusively) drawn from what may be called the upper and upper middle classes of society, the sacramental life has been thus fostered, it is curious how slight an impression this type of piety, by which the followers of the Oxford Movement have from the first set so great store, has made on the majority of professing Anglicans, who have, on the one hand, taken to their hearts most of the customs which in the early days of the Movement were looked at askance as popish innovations—choral services, surpliced processions, intoned prayers, crosses and frontals on the altar, candles and the rest—but, on the other hand, though very likely communicating more frequently than their pre-Tractarian forefathers would have done, are very far from any genuine appreciation of what those to whom it is a reality mean by the sacramental life. As far as the outward face of religion is concerned, the Oxford Movement has revolutionized the piety of the English nation; but as regards the inner side, this remains on the whole in tone and sentiment what may, in a broad sense, be called "Evangelical" rather than "Catholic." I am not for a moment suggesting that Catholicism and Evangelicalism are not compatible, or that they are not as a matter of fact found together in very many devout persons among us: but I believe it to be true, whether we like it or not, that the effect of the Oxford Movement on the general tone of English or even of lay Anglican piety has been out of all proportion less than its effects on the ideals of the ministry or of the type of worship carried on in our churches.

In conclusion, I would call attention to certain indirect results of the Oxford Movement which it is necessary to take into account in estimating its significance for the history of Anglicanism in particular and of English Christianity in general.

We saw that, theologically, the Oxford Movement stood for the reincorporation of the inspiration of the Bible in that of the Church and of the doctrine of the Atonement in that of the Incarnation.

The Tractarians were themselves as strongly persuaded of the

inerrancy of the Bible as were their Evangelical opponents; they were no less (to use the modern cant phrase) "fundametalist," though following other guides than the Evangelicals in their interpretation of the book which both alike took to be, as correctly interpreted, the infallible word of God. But what I have called the reincorporation of its inspiration in that of the Church inevitably eased the way for the acceptance by those who were then the younger generation of High Church theologians, when the crisis came which was evoked by the publication, now more than forty years ago, of *Lux Mundi*, of the legitimacy of applying to Scripture those critical methods which scholars had come to use as a matter of course in the study of other ancient documents. In the same sort of way the Tractarians were as far as possible, for the most part, from being democratic in their political sympathies. Some of them indeed, who inherited (as did Keble) the traditions of the older High Church party, were deeply attached to the political and social institutions which had been assailed, along with the Church itself, by the rebels who had brought King Charles I. to the scaffold and subverted the ancient constitution of the country at the time of the Civil War. They were indeed filled with a Christian charity which impelled them to self-sacrifice in the service of Christ's poor; but their general championship of what I called the "other-worldly" view, which they shared with the Evangelicals, made them look with suspicion on any such preoccupation with social reform as might threaten its subordination to the spiritual interest of individuals in their eternal salvation. Nevertheless the reincorporation of the doctrine of the Atonement which, as understood by the Evangelicals and taken by itself as the centre of religious teaching, tended to focus attention upon the ultimate destiny of the individual, in the doctrine of the Incarnation and the consequent indwelling of God in the society which is called in Scripture "the body of Christ," prepared the way for that later union of Anglo-Catholic devotion with zeal for social reform as the expression of faith in that doctrine which was seen in the teaching and leadership of men like Henry Scott Holland and Charles Gore or in the practical ministry of men like Robert Dolling.

The first effect of the Oxford Movement was to some extent to increase the traditional isolation of the Anglican Church by emphasizing characteristics—such as the Apostolical Succession—which distinguish it from most of the Protestant churches abroad as well as from the Nonconformist churches at home—without, as the event has shown, bringing it any nearer to corporate reunion with Rome. We may think the stress laid on the Apostolic Succession of its episcopate by the Tractarians

and their followers to have been disproportionate, and may even find ourselves inclined to smile at the neat theory, in the belief of which I was brought up, of the true Catholic Church with its three "branches"—Roman, Greek and Anglican—outside of which was nothing but heresy and schism. Yet it is but fair to say that if, far though we still may be from that reunion of Christendom for which we pray, union on a far larger scale than would have been dreamed of as practicable when I was young is now "practical politics" in a sense in which it was not then, this is in part because it is widely acknowledged that any possible programme of unification must include the so-called "historic episcopate," so that unquestionably the party of the Oxford Movement, by bringing this forward, with however much exaggeration of its relative importance, have made a contribution to the solution of the problem of reunion which could not have been made by a school of thought less studious of ecclesiastical tradition and less possessed with the idea of organic continuity.

The centenary of the Oxford Movement finds the Church of England as a whole prepared to celebrate it with thankfulness as having been the means of quickening it to a new sense of reverence in worship, a loftier ideal of the ministerial office, a deeper appreciation of the sacramental life. But we may not forget that the cultivation of these gifts must be controlled by a firm grasp of principles apart from the maintenance of which reverence may be degraded into superstition, priestliness into priestcraft, sacramentalism into something dangerously like idolatry.

Such are the principles involved in the Scriptural sayings that the whole law is summed up in love to God and to our neighbour; that all Christians have access through Christ by one Spirit unto the Father; that not what enters into the mouth but what cometh out of the heart defileth a man; that neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature; that God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

These sayings were, of course, familiar enough to the men of the Oxford Movement, nor would any of their followers dispute their authority. But the principles which they express are not merely to be acquiesced in, they are to be, so to say, alive in us, serving as a perpetual criterion and text of all our religious thought, instructions, and practice, so that we may never allow these to fall below a level worthy of that liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

C. C. J. WEBB.

THE IDEALS OF THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN*

I AM sure we shall all feel it undesirable that the last speaker at such a Conference as this should introduce any controversial note. But I feel bound in honesty to state in a few words my own position in regard to the main issue, before I go on. I am opposed to the giving of the priesthood to women; for many reasons, and chiefly because I feel that so complete a break with Catholic tradition cannot be made save by the consent of a united Christendom. Any local or national Church which makes it will drop at once to the level of an eccentric sect. On the other hand, I greatly desire and also expect an immense extension and recognition of women's ministry in other directions than this. Properly "rooted and grounded" in lives of real simplicity and self-abandonment, this must conduce to the well-being and enriching of the Church's life. Hence the great importance for the future of a right conception of our situation—what we have to give, and how we can give it best. But these, after all, are merely the views of one insignificant individual looking out on the external situation; and any individual view of that external situation, how it should and how it may develop, is mostly guess-work at the best. We do not want to end there; but rather by reminding ourselves once more of those realities on which anything pleasing to God in our work must depend. If we are true to those realities and seek to increase our hold upon them, then surely, whatever our status as workers for the Church and whatever recognition we may get and all that, we shall be able to be useful to Him and to souls. And that, and that alone, is the point.

What, after all, *is* Christian ministry, male or female, lay or ecclesiastical? It is, or should be, just the attempt of someone who cares supremely about God to cherish and help, in one way or another, the souls that are loved by God: to be as one that serveth. And moreover it is an attempt that is made, not because we feel like it, but because we are decisively pressed, called, put to it. "You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you." The word "vocation" does not mean that we do the calling. It is true, alas, that we often seem to see this principle ignored; but is it worth while to consider the sort and degree of pastoral work which we *might* do, unless we are prepared to do everything which comes our way from that centre? "Lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep." That is the real point, isn't it? and the

* Paper read at the Conference called by the Central Council for Women's Church Work, October, 1932.

only one. Over against that, all discussions about our call and status, and what we ought to be allowed to do, and what we have to contribute, and whether the shepherds accept us as trained shepherdesses, or more often regard us as auxiliary dogs—all that fades into silence.

That real teaching saint, Father Benson of Cowley, said: "It is a sign of perfection to be willing to do anything"—yes, even under the orders of the curate you don't much like. Supple, equal to any burden and any job, because the burden of one's own importance has been given up. Surely a body of women aiming at that type of perfection would do more for God than a body of women who had achieved some particular status. The work that endures, and that is worth while, comes always from an immense self-surrender; and only that kind of ministry is going to increase the power and vitality of the Church. It really is not worth our while to struggle for the opportunity of giving anything less than that. No kind of assertiveness whatsoever can serve the purpose of the supernatural life. That merely blocks the Divine right of way—prevents the Spirit from filtering through. If it is true—and I think, perhaps, it is true—that the movement of that Spirit within the Church is opening fresh paths along which women can serve God and souls, then how careful we must all be to balance our initiative and devotedness by great patience, suppleness, and self-oblivion. We surely cannot really wish to give up the sacred privilege of the lowest place. Here we must try to avoid all doctrinaire conclusions which arise from disguised self-will, and be entirely at the disposal of God.

Do you remember the beautiful story of the vision of Pier Pettignano? He saw the Church visible as a superb procession following after Christ on the Way of the Cross—all the ecclesiastics, dignitaries, and officials, each in their place and each with their credentials. And at the end of it all came the shabby little figure of St. Francis, in his patched tunic, with no orders, no credentials, no position, drawn only by love. And he alone was walking in the very footsteps of the Crucified.

I have known a few women in my life who have genuinely ministered to souls in a creative way: who truly gave the living water and the heavenly food. They have all been extremely simple and unpretentious. The question of status, scope and all that has never, I should think, entered their minds at all. Their hidden life of love and prayer—and here surely is a capital point—has largely exceeded and entirely supported their lives of active work. That, it seems to me, is the ministry which the Church so desperately wants; and if we are ever to give it, it means that our inner life towards God must be twice—no,

ten, a hundred times—more vivid, constant and courageous than anything our active life may demand of us. For only thus can we ever begin to learn charity; and it is only in charity that men and women can minister to each other spiritual things. How else indeed could turbulent, half-made, self-willed creatures like ourselves hope to keep themselves at the disposal of God? If He is to find in us fresh channels of His life-giving life, the proportion of our hidden prayer to our active life must be the proportion of root to tree. But are we prepared, do you think, for all that such a scheme of life will cost us—the tremendous training it will mean, and the reversal of values it involves? A return, in fact, to the values of the New Testament. And if not, is it worth while to worry about our external scope? Movements and demands, however legitimate, can be actually dangerous if they deflect attention from the one thing that is needful to the many things that may be useful or expedient. So, if there *is* to be a new movement in the Church, a removal of barriers and a new opportunity of pastoral service for women, how terribly careful we should be that it begins in a movement of the heart; and that this movement should be, as Von Hügel says, vertical first and horizontal afterwards. Don't you think that what the Church needs most, is not more and more officials, but more and more people freely self-given for love? People who work from the centre, and radiate God because they possess Him: people in whom, as St. Teresa said, Martha and Mary combine. No use getting Martha that splendid up-to-date gas cooker, if you have to shove Mary out of the way to find a place where it can stand.

Just notice those women in the past who have ministered with most conspicuous success to souls: the heads of our profession, the women saints. Christians ought always to keep on looking at them, looking at the top. They must be our patterns, as the Curé d'Ars is the pattern for the parish priest; so we ought to keep our eye on them. They represent, each in their own intensely distinctive way, the classic norm of women's ministry. And the first thing we notice about them is, that all were devoured by the immensity of their love and abandonment to God and Christ; and how all else flows from this, and depends on their faithful, selfless, interior adherence. And next, I think, we notice a sort of beautiful informality and freedom in their proceedings; and something which we might call a maternal and domestic quality in their method, which seems on the whole to look more towards the prophetic than the priestly way of serving God and tending souls. We see them gathering little groups about them, creating spiritual families, on whom they exercise a transforming power; giving people God in a

very unofficial way. Of course, we know and recognize that the Church needs both these types—they complete each other—but is it not here that women seem to find their best place? As individuals surrendered to the Spirit, moving and working under His pressure, and yet with great freedom and originality, within the institutional frame?

And next observe how quiet and hidden on the whole their best work is; and how sometimes when it develops and becomes public and they get a status—and especially when they begin to tell people in general what they ought to do and how things ought to be done, and the mother of souls becomes a reformer—they seem to charm us less, and tell us less of God. Most of us, I think, are definitely at our best in a limited environment; and it is only our best we want to give, isn't it? Our home-making talents and our instinct for nurture, teaching, loving, the power of concentrating on the individual, on the weak or the damaged, the intuitive touch on character and the understanding of it—these are the points at which women have something of real value to give to pastoral work. It is surely not when St. Hildegarde becomes a public figure, a great woman, and enters the sphere of controversy, or when Elizabeth Fry makes a semi-royal progress through Europe, stiff with black silk and consciousness of her own vocation, that we feel them most to be agents of God. Somehow, then, the interior simplicity on which all hangs seems to melt away. Even the great St. Teresa said that her five happiest years were spent hidden away in the tiny convent of St. Joseph, training her little group of daughters in the interior life.

I feel I want women to retain something of that precious suppleness, simplicity and freedom which makes us tools fit for many purposes. It is so much better just to be able to say "Send me" without having to add "where I shall have my position properly recognized or opportunities to use my special gifts." It is God we want to get recognized—not us. If you look again at the women saints, you will see that with them that is usually so. They often had immense difficulties, emerging as most of them did within a Church far more rigidly organized than ours. They often suffered from the jealousy, misunderstanding and suspicion of their contemporaries. But they did feed some sheep; and that is what matters after all. Look at St. Catherine in her little room at Siena, surrounded by her spiritual sons, or Madame Acarie fulfilling her vocation in and through her family life and becoming the "Conscience of Paris." Consider those great lives, burning with charity; let us measure our thoughts about the ministry of women by them. A clear recognition of that standard they set is going

to help women Churchworkers through their ups and downs, far better than any external change in our position can do. This change may turn out to be useful and desirable; but if the other side is lacking, it won't do much for the real life of the Church. All kinds of claimfulness are so foreign to the Christian genius, that every movement of this kind involves a certain spiritual risk; whereas every movement towards humility and hiddenness actually increases our real value to God and the Church. This does not mean softness or inefficiency—it merely means leaving ourselves out.

Surely it is a good thing that the two orders of service within the Church should be different: and there *is* a mass of social and spiritual work, teaching and guidance both individual and general, and detailed training in the interior life, in which it is certain that women can and should give far more service than they have yet done. And the Church should welcome such ministry, and extend these opportunities. But even where the welcome is a little bit on the frosty side—for we know that the institutional mind is not always very elastic—that does not justify *our* making a fuss. In all those new developments of Christian method which must come, and ought to come, with changing times, I am sure that women should do, and will have to do, many new and responsible kinds of spiritual work in so far as they are fitted for it. But the fitness matters most; that interior poise which enables us to take any job, from the most desperate to the most homely, and link up the outward action with the unchanging Eternity whose purpose we are here to serve. If a new era in women's life in the Church really is opening, do not let us come to it inwardly unprepared, because we are in such a hurry to begin. I suppose, in the first century, the Church's need of workers was just as great as ours; but St. Paul thought it was worth while to begin by hiding himself for three years in Arabia, in order that he might discover what the Spirit desired him to do. I have a feeling that we ought to do something like that. For improvement in our position, or the mere multiplication of women serving in the Church, will do nothing to extend the Kingdom unless those who enter on this career really are light-bringing souls, as Von Hügel said; and they will only be that in proportion to their active self-abandonment, the extent to which they ignore their own preferences and so become sensitive to God.

So I think that efforts to defend and expand the ministry of women in the Church will be useless for the deeper purposes of the Spirit, unless there is a ceaseless recognition that usefulness in religion means usefulness to God; and usefulness to God depends upon ceaseless co-operation with Him. And this, again,

requires a sensitiveness to the movement of the Spirit impossible without a steady and disciplined interior life of prayer. I do not mean to suggest by this that the Spirit only acts through saints. The marvellous thing is, that in the true ministry of Christendom God so constantly uses sinners; but I do think they have got to be very loving and grateful sinners, entirely free from any notions about the importance of their own status and their own work. If this temper of soul, this profound humility, is sought by us, then I should feel the future as regards the ministry of women was absolutely safe. Without it, we should, perhaps, be wise to ponder the advice which the saintly Abbé Huvelin gave to a distinguished lady of our own communion who consulted him about her numerous religious activities: "Madame, distrust your own zeal for doing good to others."

EVELYN UNDERHILL.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

DR. LYTTELTON asks us to correct an error, to which Fr. Pulley, S.S.J.E., has drawn his attention, in the article on "The Last Things," which he contributed to the December issue of THEOLOGY. The two sermons of Dean Church to which he referred are not in his *Cathedral and University Sermons*, but in the volume of his University Sermons entitled *Human Life and its Conditions*.

The last year has seen a steady growth in the variety and interest of the fare which the *Guardian* provides for its readers; and rarely a week passes now when something of real importance is not to be found in it. In particular the recent series of "Essays in Construction," by the Dean of Exeter merits careful attention. The essay on "Was Jesus mistaken?" which appeared in the issue of December 9th, strikes us as one of the most effective discussions of the *Interimsethik* problem we have seen, and its conclusion as to the nature of the difference between our Lord's ethic and that of the best secular philosophy abundantly fruitful and true.

We drew attention in these notes to *The Story of Christendom*, Part I., at the time when it appeared; and we are glad to extend a like welcome to Part II. of Mrs. Duncan-Jones's work, which bears the sub-title "Reformers in Christendom" (St. Christopher Press and S.P.C.K., 2s. net). Its 190 pages cover the history of Christendom from the Cluniac revival in the tenth century to the efflorescence of Puritanism in the seventeenth; and a series of well-chosen illustrations, together with a map of Europe, add point to the narrative. *The Story of Christendom* was first planned in connexion with the Portsmouth Diocesan Syllabus, where the Church history courses are based upon it; and both schools and Sunday schools should find it most useful. But it would be a mistake to regard it as a book only for young people: for there runs through the story a point of view—a philosophy of history—which even the oldest amongst us may find edifying and refreshing. We shall look forward meanwhile to Part III.

CORRESPONDENCE

I

SIR,

In gratitude to Mr. le Messurier may I suggest the following classification of sermons?

I. HOMILETIC—this includes:

Evangelistic—to the outsider—to arouse, stimulate, warn, rebuke.

General exhortation of the converted.

Devotional—for the growing saint.

These all appeal to the heart and soul, the emotions and affections.

II. INSTRUCTIONAL—this includes:

Doctrinal—the plain teaching and application of the beliefs of the Christian religion, the fundamentals of the Faith.
Expository—*i.e.*, of Holy Scripture.
Evidential—the defence of Christianity against attack and error and doubt—"apologetics."

These all appeal to the head and the intellect.

III. PRACTICAL—this includes:

Ethical—*i.e.*, Christian conduct.

The appeal here is to the will and the conscience.

Topical—the treatment of current events, problems and experiences (*e.g.*, General Election, disasters, popular novels and plays, local legends and traditions, harvest, hospitals, Friendly Societies, etc. Kingsley has a sermon on the Days of the Week and their names. This type of sermon is popular with children; even "yo yo" has been utilized and quite effectively; see *Expository Times* for November).

While all these types of sermon overlap, it would make for better and more effective preaching if sermons were chosen and schemed out in batches, several weeks ahead, and in such a manner as to ring the changes on the various types, so that each sermon should have a predominating purpose and character.

Yours truly,
S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

RINGWOOD.

II

November 20, 1932.

DEAR SIR,

I was interested to read the Rev. C. T. H. Dams's letter in your November issue. Your readers may perhaps be interested in the following extract from *The Calendar of the Prayer-Book* (James Parker and Co., 1870), pp. 183 *f.*, which a friend has kindly shown to me.

"In early representations of the Trinity, the doctrine of the Three in One was represented by such devices as the triangle, or three circles intersecting each other. In later representations, the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity are more distinctly defined, the Holy Ghost being most generally represented between the Father and the Son (as in the illustration which is taken from the *Heures du Duc d'Anjou*, Bib. Roy., belonging to the close of the thirteenth century), either as a dove only, with the nimbus, or as a human form, with a dove perched upon His arm or head. A number of curious engravings of these subjects may be seen in Didron's *Iconographie Chrétienne*, from which these illustrations are taken. Some are particularly deserving of notice, as, for instance, two from a MS. of the thirteenth century in the Bibliothèque Royale of Paris, which represent the Trinity creating man. Those of the fifteenth century show a great and irreverential decline in symbolic character, representing the Father as a pope, far advanced in years, the Son as a vigorous man, and the Holy Spirit in the midst as the youngest of the Three."

It seems clear that I was wrong in my guess that artists had almost (if not quite) universally avoided depicting the Holy Spirit in human form. But I think this quotation bears out my idea that the conception of the Holy Spirit implied by such representations is of late growth. I wish I knew more precisely what the writer meant by "early" and "late" representations.

Yours sincerely,
ROBERT H. MOBERLY.

CHESHUNT.

III

THE LATE SIR RONALD ROSS

October 3, 1932.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

It is not a little strange that the many excellent notices of the work of the late Sir Ronald Ross which have appeared in *The Times* and elsewhere should omit to refer to the very real and vital part which prayer played in his life and to its part in the epoch-making discovery of the cause of malaria. I have frequently (in the pages of the *Church Quarterly* and elsewhere) drawn attention to his little volume of verse entitled *Philosophies*, published by John Murray at the modest price of two shillings. In that volume are two poems dated respectively 1890 and 1897, in which he records first his prayer to God for enlightenment in the task of finding the "unseen, small, but million-murdering cause" of Indian fevers; and seven years later his Te Deum for the revelation vouchsafed to him, whereby he was given a "light wherewith to mend the world." I know of no more striking instance in our own day of the efficacy of prayer, and in the field of scientific research.

Yours, etc.,
ALBERT O. COCK.

NEW YORK.

IV

November 12, 1932.

SIR,

The alternative form for a conclusion to the Te Deum proposed by Dr. Prideaux in the November number of THEOLOGY is very attractive; but it seems doubtful whether an address to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity can appropriately be added in view of the possibility that the whole was originally a hymn sung to Christ as God, verses 11, 12, 13 being an early interpolation.

Dr. Julian (*Dict. Hymnology*) argues in favour of two hymns: 1-10 and 14-21, both addressed to the Second Person of the Trinity.

Has it been observed that the position of the Prophets, between Apostles and Martyrs, suggests that *Christian* Prophets are meant?

In that case a second-century origin seems to be required.

Yours obediently,
H. M. SLEE.

ALBEMARLE CLUB,
37, DOVER STREET, W. 1.

V

DEAR SIR,

There are some points in Dr. Lowther Clarke's contribution in the July number of THEOLOGY which seem to me worth further consideration:

(*a*) "The New Testament insists that the Resurrection was unique: Christ the first-fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's."

Certainly, but in what sense was the Resurrection unique? Surely because it was not a restoration to life in this world in a natural body such as we have, but a change to life in a spiritual body—a glorious body, such as we hope to have.

"It is inconceivable that the young man was thought to have passed into the other world and to have been recalled to this world."

Why? It is not easy to see exactly what the difficulty is which in Dr. Clarke's mind constitutes the inconceivableness. If the young man and Lazarus had already experienced something of the life beyond it is not difficult to suppose that all memory of that experience would be removed in order to make a resumption of life here under normal conditions practicable.

(*b*) "Our Lord refused to work miracles contrary to nature, to produce 'signs from heaven' that would compel belief."

Why consider the restoration of a dead person to life contrary to nature, when presumably not merely the restoration of sight once possessed but the gift of sight to one who had never had it is not contrary to nature?

Our Lord refused to produce signs from heaven that would compel belief. Quite so: but what has this fact got to do with Dr. Clarke's argument? Whatever may have been the exact nature of the miracle performed both in this case and in the raising of Jairus' daughter, both St. Luke and those present appear to have believed that a dead person had been restored to life. That being the case the value of the miracle as evidence and its power to compel belief remain the same to those who witnessed it, whether the young man was dead in a strictly scientific sense of the term or was only in a state of suspended animation which more or less closely resembled death.

For myself the great objection to Dr. Clarke's interpretation is the difficulty of reconciling it with a belief in the perfect honesty of our Lord Himself. To sum up, it appears to me that neither (*a*) nor (*b*) provides a sound foundation for the conclusion based on them, and the interpretation as a whole gets rid of one difficulty only to raise another, and, to my mind, a much more serious one.

JOHN GOODCHILD.

BRINGTON RECTORY,
HUNTINGDON.

VI

December 6, 1932.

DEAR SIR,

There is one point in Dr. Lyttelton's helpful and interesting article this month on which I should like to make some observations. On page 318 he seems to imply that the Parable of the Sower contradicts the idea that those lost may be few.

I suppose many of us on reading the parable unconsciously think of the four kinds of soil as occupying *four equal parts* of the field. But is

that necessary? Is it likely that a farmer would keep in cultivation a piece of ground of which only one-quarter contained suitable soil? If the hard ground was, as is often understood, a pathway trodden across the field, it would only form a very small portion of the ground. The weedy portion was very likely that at the borders under the wall-fence; and it does not seem likely that any considerable portion of a cultivated field would be only a shallow coating over rock.

May we not infer, from what we should consider likely of agricultural conditions, that the "good soil" would preponderate over all the others?

Yours faithfully,
(Rev.) G. E. Boyle.

Wykeham Lodge,
Canford Cliffs,
Bournemouth.

VII

December 2, 1932.

Dear Sir,

With reference to the Rev. F. L. Cross's note on page 343 of this month's Theology, the following quotation seems to the point (it is from Anne Mozley's *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, vol. i., pp. 436-7): "I mean to send you on the other page some names of persons to whom I wish Parker and Rivington to send copies of my Sermon [on National Apostasy—J. H. N.], otherwise, like many of its betters, it will surely pass away as a dream."

So writes the Rev. J. Keble to the Rev. J. H. Newman in July, 1833. It looks (with its context) as if Keble attributed considerable importance to the Sermon.

Yours truly,
W. M. Raymond.

The Warden's Lodge,
Great Maplestead,
Essex.

NOTE

THE HOMILIES

The Book of Common Prayer sets the doctrinal standards of Anglicanism, containing as it does the rites used continually by priests and people alike. By its side are the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion to which the clergy have to "assent" at ordination and on other occasions (the present modified formula dates from 1865.) A third set of formularies is provided by the Homilies, which are prescribed by the Prayer Book as an alternative to the Sermon, and characterized in the Articles as containing "godly and wholesome doctrine."

Many clergy would confess to ignorance if challenged about the Homilies; the very name provokes an indulgent smile. But the prominent place they hold in our formularies makes it desirable that we should know a little about this first "omnibus" volume of sermons in the English language.

The first part was published in 1547, Cranmer and others being the authors. The second part, to which Jewel was the main contributor, was finished in 1563, except for the last homily, inspired by the rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland in 1569, but was not

authorized till 1571. There are thirty-three in all, varying in length considerably. Some are quite short, for they are generally divided into two or more parts, and it is suggested that they be read one half in the forenoon, the other in the afternoon. In some cases a portion of a Homily ends with the ascription, which shows that a complete discourse is intended. The first section of the Homily on Almsdeeds contains about 2,400 words, and need not have taken more than twenty-five minutes to deliver with deliberate diction. The style for the most part is admirable. The following passage is typical of many.

> Neither grudged she [the blessed Virgin Mary] at the length and tediousness of the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem, from whence and whither she must go to be taxed, neither repined she at the sharpness of the dead time of winter, being the latter end of December, an unhandsome time to travel in, specially a long journey, for a woman being in her case; but, all excuses set apart, she obeyed and came to the appointed place: where at her coming she found such great resort and throng of people, that, finding no place in any inn, she was fain, after her long, painful, and tedious journey, to take up her lodging in a stable, where also she was delivered of her blessed Child; and this also declareth how near her time she took that journey. This obedience of this most noble and most virtuous lady to a foreign and pagan prince doth well teach us, who in comparison to her are most base and vile, what ready obedience we do owe to our natural and gracious sovereign. (*Against Wilful Rebellion.*)

Or again:

> Consider the decay of the towns nigh the seas, which should be most ready by the number of the people there to repulse the enemy; and we which dwell further off upon the land, having them as our buckler to defend us, should be the more in surety. If they be our neighbours, why should we not wish them to prosper? If they be our defence, as nighest at hand to repel the enemy, to keep out the rage of the seas, which else would break upon our fair pastures, why should we not cherish them? (*Of Fasting.*)

Surely these are perfect examples of vigorous firmly-knit English, far nearer to the best models of today than the ambitious sermons of the seventeenth century, whether Anglican or Puritan.

Most of the discourses are made up of the common stock of Christianity. Being addressed to the general body of churchgoers, they keep to the high road of doctrine and practice as generally understood. *Against Peril of Idolatry*, however, is enormously long, closely reasoned, and crammed full of references to Scripture, the Fathers, and history generally. But the double method of proof, from the Bible and the Fathers, is characteristic of nearly all the Homilies. In particular, we note with interest the influence of the Old Testament upon the minds of the writers. The parallel between the godly reforming Kings of Judah, such as Hezekiah and Josiah, and "the Prince" of their own days is frequently drawn. Among the Fathers, St. Augustine's authority is paramount. Thus in *Concerning Prayer* we read: "But, admit the Saints do pray for us, yet do we not know how, whether specially for them which call upon them, or else generally for all men, wishing well to every man alike. If they pray

specially for them which call upon them, then it is like they hear our prayers, and also know our heart's desire. Which thing to be false, it is already proved, both by the Scriptures, and also by the authority of Augustine." Prayers for the dead are treated in similar fashion. A loophole is left, though the practice is discouraged. The question is "whether we *ought* to pray for them that are departed out of this world, or no. Wherein if we will cleave only unto the word of God, then must we needs grant, that we have *no commandment* so to do." This is proved by the Parable of Dives and Lazarus, by other texts, and by the testimony of SS. Augustine, Cyprian and Chrysostom.

The Holy Communion is described very beautifully (in *Concerning the Sacrament*) in phrases taken from "the ancient Catholic fathers" and "godly men," as the salve of immortality, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection. We are urged "oftentimes to covet this bread, continually to thirst for this food." "Look up with faith upon the holy Body and Blood of thy God, marvel with reverence, touch it with thy mind, receive it with thy hand, and take it fully with thy inward man."

There are two Sacraments only, "if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin and of our holiness and joining in Christ." "Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands."

The attitude towards the past is instructive. Superstition is repudiated, especially as regards the so-called holy things—"holy cowls, holy girdles, holy pardoned beads, holy shoes. . . ." (*Of Good Works*). Especially reprobated is "the blasphemous buying and selling the most precious Body and Blood of Christ in the mass" which has made the churches of England into dens of thieves "this many hundred years." (*For Repairing and Keeping Clean of Churches.*) This abuse may be contrasted with the behaviour of "our godly predecessors." (*Of the Place and Time of Prayer.*) There is no suggestion that a new Church was being set up, only that the old temple was being cleansed. Indeed the first twelve Homilies were put out before the First English Prayer Book and when no responsible person, probably, anticipated a final breach with Rome. It may be surmised that many of the Catholic-minded Churchmen who attended their parish churches in the early years of Elizabeth, and later became the separated Roman Catholic community, would have repudiated mediæval abuses as heartily as the authors of the Homilies.

The incidental references to social conditions are very interesting. The bewilderment of simple folk at the changes is illustrated by what a woman said to her neighbour: "Alas, gossip, what shall we now do at church, since all the saints are taken away, since all the goodly sights we were wont to have are gone, since we cannot hear the like piping, singing, chanting, and playing upon the organs, that we could before?" (*Of the Place and Time of Prayer.*) The moral chaos, a result of the Renaissance be it noted, not of the Reformation, which in 1547 had hardly had time to influence England, is described in *Against Whoredom and Uncleanness.* "This vice is grown into such a height, that in a manner among many it is

counted no sin at all, but rather a pastime, a dalliance, and but a touch of youth; not rebuked, but winked at; not punished, but laughed at." This should be noted in view of the tendency to ascribe the laxity of the Elizabethan stage to the influence of the Reformation. "Of this vice," proceeds the preacher, "cometh a great part of the divorces which nowadays be so commonly accustomed and used by man's private authority, to the great displeasure of God, and the breach of the most holy knot and bond of matrimony." This in a Homily set out by Henry VIII.'s authority! It is remarkable that there is no defence of the Church such as is a commonplace today, as that the Church never allows divorce, but sometimes annuls a marriage. No, in Catholic England before the break with Rome, divorce is represented as common, arising from the husband's preferring a mistress, or the wife's preferring a lover, and resulting in the sin of adultery. "In what case are those adulterers which for the love of an whore put away their true and lawful wife against all law, right, reason, and conscience?"

Wife-beating is condemned unsparingly. "If it be a great shame for a man to beat his bondservant (*i.e.*, maidservant), much more rebuke it is to lay violent hands upon his freewoman." Such a man, "if he may be called a man rather than a beast," may be likened "to a killer of his father or his mother." (*Of the State of Matrimony.*)

The Homily *Against Excess of Apparel* is amusing to modern readers. The Israelites were content to wear the same clothes and shoes for forty years (Deut. xxix. 5).

> But we are never contented, and therefore we prosper not; so that most commonly he that ruffleth in his sables, in his fine furred gown, corked slippers, trim buskins, and warm mittons, is more ready to chill for cold than the poor labouring man, which can abide in the field all the day long, when the north wind blows, with a few beggarly clouts about him. We are loth to wear such as our fathers hath left us; we think that not sufficient or good enough for us. We must have one gown for the day, another for the night; one long, another short; one for winter, another for summer; one through furred, another but faced; one for the working day, another for the holy day. . . .

If this witnesses to bygone conceptions of what luxury is, a little later a modern note is struck by the condemnation of women who paint their faces, dye and curl their hair, and "embalm" their bodies, on the pretext that they do it "to please our husband, to delight his eyes, and to retain his love toward us."

A sidelight is thrown on the need for the strong, even tyrannical, Tudor Government, by the sermon *On Obedience*, which declares that without it "no man shall ride or go by the highway unrobbed; no man shall sleep in his own house or bed unkilled; no man shall keep his wife, children, and possessions in quietness." The raw material of red revolution was present then just as it is now.

In Elizabeth's reign there was "great slackness and negligence of a great sort of people in resorting to the church." Some came later, "scarcely at noon time"—so that services cannot have been always so early as some writers contend. Some behave so badly as to walk up and down the church all service time. (*Of the Right Use of the Church.*) Lastly let us quote two more illustrations of social conditions. In the *Sermon for Rogation Week* we are told of the bad custom of ploughing up part of

the grass walks or balks between the cultivated strips of the common land. Decency dictates the leaving of at least "a broad and sufficient bierbalk to carry the corpse to the Christian sepulture." Sometimes we hear the Elizabethan enforcing of fast days for the encouragement of the fisheries disparaged. But the Homily *Of Fasting* is quite explicit on the matter. The ordinance comes from the civil magistrate and is intended to help the coast towns by making a market for their fish, and thereby to strengthen the Navy, the burden of which then fell entirely on the ports; also to lessen the demand for meat and so to bring down its price to the poor. It is explained that no religious sanction is imposed, other than the general duty of obeying the civil power. Not the religious fasts of the Church but the meatless days of the War form the true parallel.

When we are disheartened at reading a political history of the sixteenth century it is a tonic to turn to the vigorous exhortations to true religion, corporate as well as personal, contained in these famous but largely unread Homilies. The century was not so bad as it is the fashion to paint it nowadays.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

REVIEWS

FAITH AND SOCIETY. By Maurice B. Reckitt. Longmans. 15s. 6d.

This book is a sympathetic, penetrating and independent study of the Christian Social Movement in Britain and America. In its survey of the American situation, brought up to date, the book breaks new ground, and thus offers to English readers a more complete account than Mr. Binyon's authoritative *History of the Christian Socialist Movement in England*. In his desire to do justice to all work in this field, Mr. Reckitt has given, perhaps, disproportionate attention to some groups of minor importance, whose activities are scarcely worth recording, and we could have wished that some account of the contribution made by the Church Oversea had found place. A tribute is deservedly paid to the Christa Seva Sangh, but nothing is said about the stand for justice to the natives made by the South African bishops. However, a valuable record has been compiled and some shrewd estimates given of the various manifestations of the movement, and a notable feature of the book is the generous appreciation of the personalities of men with whom the author has little in common—*e.g.*, Dr. Barnes.

Mr. Reckitt is much more than a chronicler. He is a critic of the social structure who has read widely and thought deeply, and evidently has studied closely. The second part of his book is devoted to a study of Politics, Leisure, Technique, and Finance, and it is in his impeachment of current financial methods that his convictions are most clearly expressed, and he defends the conception of the "universalized dividend" with acuteness, showing that the Social Credit proposals with which we are becoming increasingly familiar are the modern equivalent of the mediæval Just Price.

The steps by which the Christian Social Movement has travelled in its search for a basis of society are traced with care. Two books have exercised a far-reaching influence—Mr. Tawney's *The Acquisitive Society* and Fr. O'Brien's *Mediæval Economics*. The latter in particular, though Mr. Reckitt scarcely does justice to its importance, was, in a true sense, "epoch-making." Its appeal lay to those who were convinced of the Catholic interpretation of life, and it ushered in an epoch in which the Catholic sociologist no longer felt obliged to borrow from the Marxian armoury, but boldly set himself to develop the implications of his own principles. This effort led him to try to discover the modern interpretation of regulations enforced in simpler days, and his line of thought intersected that of the

"Social Credit" theorists, who were following out the propositions of Major C. H. Douglas. "The obsession of employment," as Mr. Reckitt calls it, is the subject of a challenging chapter. Current assumptions make man the tool of an economic system: he has no significance except in relation to his job. When for any reason the job comes to an end, either because the worker is worn-out or the machinery obsolete, society has no further use for him. Dimly the significance of this was perceived by the Peterloo rioters who destroyed machines because they feared them. Those fears have been justified. Yet labour-lightening inventions should surely be welcomed. Here Mr. Reckitt effectively argues that what is wanted is not less but more "unemployment"! The Christian sociologist, he urges, will not be satisfied to promote employment for its own sake, but will seek to relate it to vocation and service—the need of self-expression and the needs of the community.

This is followed by a thought-provoking chapter on Leisure. The fear of leisure is not a paradoxical phrase: "the best definition of Hell," says Mr. Bernard Shaw, "is a perpetual holiday." A right ordering of society would involve a Christian ordering of work, and this in turn necessitates a Christian theory of the vastly increased leisure which would result. But we are not prepared for such an advance. "Work is the only occupation yet invented which mankind has, as yet, been able to endure in any but the smallest possible doses," says Mr. C. E. M. Joad, and it is familiar to all that the man who retires from active work very often lives but a short time—because he has nothing to live for. If the race were suddenly emancipated from the necessity of constant toil, it would be very much in the position of the horse described by Mr. Alfred Jingle when released from the shafts! The true meaning of leisure can only be understood when it is no longer looked upon as "a larceny of time belonging to other people" but as the rightful liberty of men to pursue activities of their own choice. It is questionable whether society has been in the least degree prepared for the use of such a boon, even though we can convert night into day by "flood-lit football."

"What exactly is it intended to prove?" as the mythical mathematician said of *Paradise Lost*. Mr. Reckitt's book is so full of stimulating passages and challenging observations that the general effect upon the mind of readers suffers a little from the abundance of suggestion offered. Perhaps the author would be the first to resent the enquiry as to what he is driving at. He might reply that his purpose is to make men think, and not to point the way into a ready-made Utopia. If so, he

succeeds, beyond question. But he also has a constructive Christian and Catholic sociology, and its emergence is one of the most hopeful signs of Church thought in our day. It is no longer derivative but original, no longer borrowed but independent, no longer tied to any political party but boldly cutting across all conventional lines of thought. This comparatively recent tendency has, to some extent, moved away from the older "Christian Socialism," and Mr. Reckitt's volume is probably its most complete and philosophic expression, and deserves the close attention of students of religion and of social conditions. MARCUS DONOVAN.

CARLYLE. By Emery Neff. Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 10s. 6d.

Biographies are of two kinds—those which are chiefly concerned with the author of the biography, and those which are concerned with the subject. "Conventional" biography deals, even if it deals in an interesting manner, with the man or woman whose life is therein set forth. "Modern" biography, on the other hand, is full of the author's "reactions" to the individual he is studying. Mr. Lytton Strachey gives us excellent examples of the modern type. His books are crammed with Mr. Strachey's ideas, impressions, humorous remarks, flights of fancy and charmingly posed facts, and, at the end of one of them, we know a great deal about Mr. Strachey's tastes and views, and rather less than we knew before about Queen Victoria or Florence Nightingale.

Mr. Neff's Life of Carlyle, and it is by no means dull, belongs definitely to the class of "conventional" biographies. He has, to an astonishing degree, succeeded in keeping himself out of his own book. We look in vain for the author's views and feelings. Mr. Neff may possibly have thought Jane Welsh worldly-minded when she was a girl; and he almost certainly was struck by the bleakness of Craigenputtock when he visited it. Otherwise he is as impersonal as the Recording Angel. And, we should imagine, almost as impartial and as wise.

The main facts of Thomas Carlyle's life are well known. His father, an industrious stone-mason, gave him the best education that Ecclefechan and Annan could provide, and, when the lad was not quite fourteen, sent him tramping a hundred miles to Edinburgh. As a shy, ungainly student, Thomas knew what poverty meant. Bad food and overwork, dating from his undergraduate days, tinged his moral indignation with the sour hues of dyspepsia. To be obliged to stand all through divine service in a fashionable church because he could not pay for a seat in an empty pew, gave him a sense of wrong which he never outgrew. All his life, Carlyle's prophetic

denunciations voiced obscure personal humiliations as well as the inarticulate grievances of the common people.

He thought, in turn, of being minister, lawyer, university professor. Finally, with the help of a little tutoring, he kept the wolf from the door with his pen. But he was fifty before he could be free from financial anxiety, and eighty before he was well off.

Mr. Neff makes the early years vivid to us, but once Carlyle is in the thick of his literary career, we are given too many facts. We shall not remember, even if we are told, nor are we much interested to learn, the genesis and the final destination of every article that Carlyle wrote.

On the other hand, we could have done with more of the lively pages concerning his friendships, and would gladly have heard more of the vivacious Jane, even without the reviving of old disputes better forgotten.

Probably Carlyle's most important work was *Past and Present*. *Sartor Resartus* is still read for its grim quaintness; *The French Revolution* and *Frederick the Great* are read, if at all, as experiments in literature rather than as history.

But *Past and Present*, into which the author poured his indignation and his idealism, gives the full measure of Carlyle's powers. Read it once again. England today is astonishingly like the England of Carlyle's day. Unemployment, overproduction, "liberty to starve," impotent or callous capitalists and legislators, stare us in the face now as then. An idealized twelfth-century England points as good a contrast in the twentieth as in the nineteenth century. "Ethics of chivalry" or, better still, "ethics of Jesus" would help us now as they would have helped society then if it had listened to Thomas Carlyle.

Though he won recognition as a genius, and though his bitterest denunciations came to be listened to with pleasure, Carlyle was something of a failure. Why? His creed was too indefinite. A belief in his own insight; a burning sense of the wrongs of the poor and oppressed; a theory, or many theories, on such matters as Government and the best repository of Power: these are not in themselves sufficient endowment for a prophet. A prophet must have open vision. A prophet must hear God speak. Not "I say" but "the Lord said unto me" gives authority to the message.

Carlyle lost the beliefs of his childhood and never replaced them by satisfactory beliefs born of personal experience. By his own wish, he was buried without a religious service—so symbolizing the one thing that he lacked in this life, the hand of the Lord compelling him.

We close the biography with a feeling of sadness. The

author, impersonal as he is, has put an intensely interesting epoch most vividly before us. And here we are, in the year 1932, still wrestling with the same problems which tormented thinkers a hundred years ago. Carlyle, were he alive now, would stand up and denounce our futility as he denounced the futility of our forefathers. Yet surely he would have been in his right place in the pulpit, saying, at great length, in Teutonic phraseology, "Seek ye *first* the Kingdom of Heaven. . . ."

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

HILDEBRANDINE ESSAYS. By J. P. Whitney, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

Professor Whitney's old pupils all over the world will welcome this volume, and read it with a pleasure recalling the days of student life in Canada, London, or Cambridge, when a singularly attractive personality lectured on one of the most remarkable ecclesiastical figures in European history. Dr. Whitney—who has been followed by Dr. Z. N. Brooke—was the inaugurator of modern Hildebrandine studies in this country. Both were editors of the *Cambridge Medieval History* and contributed chapters on the Hildebrandine period. In the present volume the Dixie Professor liberally supplements his work in that magnificent undertaking. He presents a balanced and catholic characterization of Gregory VII. But one sometimes wonders whether the historian's scales supply a complete test for the quality of a historical character. Does the balance ever arrive at more than quantity—at the impress made on later ages by the weight of a great man's tradition? At any rate, it is the conviction of the present reviewer that the scales will be tipped against Gregory, if against the splendid paradox of his success in failure there be thrown into the balance his defects of personal temperament, as revealed in his own letters. Yet in this book we have an erudite scholar's conclusions, and no one can afford to leave them unconsidered.

The first three essays consist of work printed elsewhere, but those on the Hildebrandine Ideal, and on Peter Damiani and Humbert, have been considerably revised, the former very considerably, with many pages of new matter—at one point no less than seventeen—together with numerous other additions. All this supplementation brings these two chapters abreast of recent investigation, and we may note in passing that Professor Whitney's essay on Damiani and Humbert, mainly devoted to the former, is the only adequate English interpretation of the hermit of Fonte Avellana which we possess. Professor Whitney responds *con amore* to Damiani's glowing religious spirit, and he has the scholar's appreciation for a great reader and maker

of books, who was perhaps the chief literary figure of his own generation.

The second essay, entitled "Gregory VII.," which contains a most valuable summary of Hildebrandine literature, has been but little revised. It has escaped the author's notice that he has reprinted his earlier statement concerning Peitz's "promised" edition of Gregory's *Registers*, a statement which has, of course, become out of date since the appearance of that work in two parts (1920-1923). We should have valued his opinion of Fliche's second volume on *La Réforme grégorienne*, which appeared in 1925. Moreover, when Professor Whitney described Dr. Brooke's chapters in Volume V. of the *Cambridge Medieval History* (1926) on Gregory VII. as "the latest and truest picture of his life," he had not seen the volume entitled *Hildebrand* (*Gregory VII.*) published by Messrs. Methuen in May, 1932. To make this comment implies no criticism of Dr. Brooke's admirable work, to which, indeed, sufficient attention has not been given.

The fourth and fifth essays contain short and succinct accounts of the city of Milan during the religious disputes of the eleventh century, and of Berengar of Tours, the leader of the second eucharistic controversy. With Berengar Professor Whitney deals more sympathetically than most conservative writers.

Coming to some points of detail, it is surely somewhat unsafe to affirm that the English policy of Gregory reveals his true aims better than his relationship with other countries. Moreover, the suggestion that the Pope was free from dislike or jealousy of lay power, and that he was patient in action, seems to be hardly borne out by Gregory's statements. It may be true that Gregory, at the beginning, was prepared to work with "the young king," but only on his own terms. Nor does it seem quite fair to Henry to allege that he constantly disregarded the law against simony and lay election. Indeed, the estimate of Henry IV. is that of earlier German historians from Gfrörer to Giesebrecht, although the work of Meyer von Knonau and Hauck is not overlooked.

But as we close Professor Witney's book we feel that we have had a feast of wine on the lees. The lover of books, as well as the historian, will be attracted by his masterly knowledge of the literature of the period, both medieval and modern; and in the footnotes, frequently illuminated by the author's comments on other authors, pleasure will be found by the bibliophile, and guidance for the historical student. Flashes of erudition appear in paragraphs of weighty discussion, so deftly turned on, that the narrative presents ease and lightness, and renders the reader's task amid a difficult period of history an easy one.

A. J. MACDONALD.

NOTICES

MOSS OF SHREWSBURY. By his Wife. Sheldon Press. 6s.

It must surely be a unique event that one Public School should have been under the rule of only three Head Masters during a period of 110 years. And such Head Masters: Samuel Butler, Benjamin Hall Kennedy, Henry Whitehead Moss. The book under review is an account of the last of the Great Three, and the writer of the review was under him at Shrewsbury during his later years. How well and affectionately I remember him: formidable at a distance, and to younger boys; kind, human, yet always Olympian, as we grew older and knew him better. Mrs. Moss writes finely of his "sympathetic, though well-controlled nature"; of the innocence of evil which was always characteristic of him. And in one excellent phrase of his own, not about himself, he hits off perfectly one side of himself.

He writes of "exactness and elegance of scholarship." That, indeed, he had, and by it he maintained and extended the great classical reputation of the school. His school sermons were examples of his refinement of temperament. They were carefully prepared, finely phrased, and always interesting. I well remember the first Sunday of one term. We had, as usual, provided ourselves for the journey back to school with comic newspapers, and a certain cheap green-covered journal whose name I need not particularize. The Head Master disposed of them in one phrase: "Snippets of feeble jesting and patchwork pieces of indigestible information."

The supreme achievement of Moss's Head Mastership was the removal of the school from the beautiful but hopelessly cramped buildings in the town to the matchless site on Kingsland. He became Head, at the age of twenty-four, in 1866; this, the greatest event since 1555, came about in 1882, after years of strenuous opposition from every quarter. From the move dates the renewed life of the school.

This book is of deep interest to all who care for our Public Schools. To Old Salopians in middle life it brings vividly back memories of things past, "ah me, this many a day," and makes us homesick for the times that will never return. But above all it recalls one whom we knew, whom now we praise among the famous men. His name will be remembered as long as his great school stands above the Severn, looking at the Wrekin and the hills of Wales.

FRANCIS UNDERHILL.

BACK TO CHRIST. From Essays in Catholic Morals. By the Rev. Jacques Leclercq. Translated by the Rev. Francis Day, B.A. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 6s.

This work is in the typical style of the average French textbook on any subject, the chief characteristics being a thorough-going elaboration of the obvious and an academic dryness, making the subject quite remote from real life. And yet now and then there is a flash of something better, a luminous sentence, a penetrating judgment. Especially valuable is the repeated reminder that "the essential function of religion does not consist in teaching men how they should behave in their relations to each

other, nor even in pointing the way to human happiness, but rather in establishing true relations between man and God." And there are welcome warnings as to the danger of confusing general and particular precepts, or simplicity with childishness. With the statement of fundamentals no one could quarrel, but occasionally the inferences drawn from the fundamentals are extremely doubtful, especially in the long chapter on charity. The translation seems to be correct, but has not been able to redeem the original stodginess. It has not withstood the besetting temptation of Roman Catholic translators: the excessive use of clumsy Latinisms.

V. I. RUFFER.

BOOK NOTES

Flowers in Church. By I. Caudwell. Mowbray. 2s. A book of this length on a detail can hardly be written without including unnecessary information—"scissors will be found useful for trimming off dead leaves," flowers on the altar must not be placed so as to "tickle the priest's face," etc.; perpetuating pious but unfounded customs—on Easter Day "lilies alone should decorate the sanctuary"; and suggesting unnecessary elaboration—"great leopard bane" for March 18 (St. Edward) and "bulbous fumitory" for March 21 (St. Benedict). But such examples give an unfair picture of a book which will give delight to the devout ladies who offer up to the service of God in the sanctuary the loveliest products of His creation.

THE KEBLE BOOKS. *From Trouble to God.* By G. P. Trevelyan. *The Worship of the Church.* By A. Bellars. *The Church and the World.* By Bishop Welldon. *God and Life.* By S. H. Clark. Skeffington. 3s. 6d. each. A great increase in the output of theological books (about fifty more were sent for review in this journal in 1932 than in 1931) must be our excuse to authors and publisher for doing no more than welcome in a few words these useful books. The popularization of views generally held by many of the clergy is a necessary task, but does not lend itself to theological comment. It is interesting to reflect what John Keble would have made of the warm Evangelicalism of Canon Clark's book, which differs so widely from the Protestant Erastianism which he so disliked.

The Re-interpretation of Jesus in the New Testament. By C. L. Purinton. Scribners. 7s. 6d. This American study book, which treats of some of the New Testament books so far as their contribution to our knowledge of the life and teachings of Jesus is concerned, is written with exceptional lucidity and considerable knowledge of recent literature. As is perhaps inevitable, it simplifies a complex problem unduly. A statement that "a second word for love . . . is *filia*, the Greek form being retained in the English word 'filial,'" suggests that the writer's undoubted knowledge is based too much on a study of secondary authorities.

The Faith and Conduct of a Churchman. By A. C. Buchanan. Allen and Unwin. 3s. Endeavours "to cover the whole Faith and Practice of a Catholic . . . a full-blooded Catholicism in our own Communion." Very clear, attractively written, and suitable for those who accept without question the foundations on which the superstructure is built.

The Golden Prologue. By W. H. G. Holmes. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. Father Holmes' writings are marked by an attractive blend of devotion and deep thought. Here he studies "The Last Gospel."

A Newman Synthesis. 5s. *The Things that are not Cæsar's.* By J. Maritain. 5s. *Christ our Brother.* By K. Adam. 3s. 6d. Sheed and Ward. Our readers will be glad to know that cheap editions of these books, reviewed in THEOLOGY in December, July, and November, 1931, respectively, are now obtainable.

A Guide to Prayer. By George Snow. Philip Allan. 2s. A book for schoolboys at the time of their Confirmation, equally admirable for what it includes and what it omits. The user can choose whether to follow the words of the Communion Service on the right-hand page or hints for meditation on the main thought of the prayer on the left-hand.

The Palace of Penitents. By Hermione Grace Warren. Stock. 3s. 6d. This little book of helps to self-examination, though a Mirfield Father in the preface says it is "of very real value," is one to be left alone. Many of the "sins" enumerated by the author are unwisely formulated: "being self-preservative," "not giving God a tenth part of one's income," "using too much powder," "not taking the trouble to find out about problems of . . . science," etc. The application of language suggested by sexual intercourse to the act of Holy Communion is well intentioned but the height of unwisdom, though there are famous precedents. And a sentence like "in the Mass the Motherhood of Jesus offers still the Sacrifice of His Life" is deplorable.

Understanding Christianity. By H. S. Marshall. Skeffington. 2s. Short chapters based on lectures given in a parish to accompany the reading of Bishop Gore's *Jesus of Nazareth.*

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER